DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 103 CG 010 273

AUTHOR Mertens, William J.
TITLE Review of Some Dropout Research and Literature.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 5 Jul 72
CONTRACT OEC-0-72-0647
NOTE 109p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$5.70 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Youth; *Dropout Prevention; *Dropouts; *Educational Improvement; Literature Reviews; Motivation; *School Improvement; Sex Differences; Social Factors; Values

ABSTRACT

Dropouts are considered to deviate from the following norms: maintaining certain levels of performance in school work; submitting to the requirements of classroom and school management; abiding by the moral codes of schools; conforming to peer group expectations; and seeking to move into the cultural mainstream of middle class white America. The author suggests the substitution of "school-leaver" for "dropout", since the latter has derogatory implications. Dropout prevention programs are of two types: those that attempt to promote student conformity to existing norms, (counseling, behavior modification and parental involvement efforts are the means used to achieve this goal); and those that attempt to modify the norms (efforts to change students' environments through job training and classroom innovation are some of the means used to attain this goal). The author considers these prevention programs as unsatisfactory, offers certain suggestions as to which norms should be adopted, and makes recommendations about how schools could function according to these norms. (Author/SE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Kavruck

ED116103

REVIEW OF SOME DROPOUT RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

by William J. Mertens
408 E Street, S.E.
Washington, D.C. 20003
Contract No.: OEC-0-72-0847
July 5, 1972

CG 010 273

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONTENTS

I. Summary Statement. 1

II. Literature on Dropouts' Commonalities. . . . 6

III. Dropouts' Differences. 15

IV. Norms of the School. 25

V. Studies of Specific Locales. 35

VI. Pushouts 51

VII. Women Dropouts 62

VIII. Dropout Definitions and Accounting Procedures. 69

IX. ESEA Title VIII Projects 93

X. Recommendations. 101

References

I. SUMMARY STATEMENT

Many dropout studies seem to proceed from the assumption that all dropouts tend to be alike. Researchers conducting these studies thus seek from their data correlation indices, measures of central tendency, and other indicators of commonality among dropouts. Another body of literature, however, emphasizes how dropouts differ. Included here are a study of differences between dropouts of different I.Q. levels, some speculative inquiries into the dropout phenomenon, and studies of some particular locales. An examination of this literature has led to the conclusion that nearly all dropouts can be considered to be deviants from the social system of high schools, but that they differ in the norms from which they deviate and in the mechanisms through which they leave school. Classes of norms to which schools expect students to conform include:

— Maintaining certain levels of performance in school work. To meet this expectation students must not only possess certain skills and levels of competence but must also adapt to the specific modes of instruction in which they are taught.

— Submitting to the requirements of classroom and school management. Students must allow their behavior to be regulated for the convenience of their teachers and administrators.

— Moral expectations. Students are frequently expected to abide by the moral codes of their teachers and administrators.

— Peer group expectations. Students experience pressure to conform to the norms of their fellow students.

-- Norms generated from schools' social functions. Where schools, in their evolution, have come to perform specific functions in their communities, these functions create sets of expectations for students.

This last set of norms is particularly important. Analyses are presented of some school systems that operate to acculturate members of certain sub-cultures into middle class life. These schools expect of students that they reject their own sub-culture, behave like middle class Americans, and avoid any means of mobility except individual, goal-oriented self-improvement. Such schools have very high dropout rates.

Though the act of dropping out is more or less voluntary for most students who are labeled by schools as deviants, others are ejected from school. Sometimes this ejection is for the violation of norms that have political connotations, and students do not always obtain due process. There are unresolved legal questions in this area. There is evidence, too, that a large number of black students, perhaps as many as 100,000 a year, are expelled from newly desegregated schools.

There are other classes of pushouts. Three of these are: members of cultural minorities for whom there are no programs; students whom some schools refuse to serve, as the physically handicapped and pregnant; and students with unique needs not served by schools, as the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed, and those with perceptual handicaps.

Though it seems reasonable to believe that the dropping out of women is a different phenomenon from the dropping out of men, there is little research on this issue. There is indication that individual interests are more strongly related to educational attainment for women than for men, and women dropouts are much more likely than men to be married soon after they leave school. Further, women dropouts are much less likely than men to be employed after leaving. In addition, there is some evidence that teachers and counselors persist in stereotyping women's roles, though this fact, if it is a fact, has not been linked to dropping out.

An examination of some theoretical studies of dropouts has revealed differences in the use of that term. Despite some problems, the pupil and dropout accounting system proposed by Putnam and Tankard in the U.S. Office of Education and by the National Education Association Project on School Dropouts represents a vast improvement over the chaos that preceded it. It has yet to be adopted, however. Even ESEA Title VIII projects persist in using non-systematic procedures. One reform that might have some beneficial consequences would be to abandon the derogatory word "dropout" in favor of a neutral term, such as "school-leaver."

The analysis of dropping out as social deviance lends itself well to a critique of ESEA Title VIII dropout prevention projects. For the most part, the projects are based on needs assessments that rest on superficial theories of causality. Generally speaking, project efforts may be placed into two classes: those that attempt to promote students' conformity to existing norms; and those that attempt to modify the norms. In the first class belong counseling, behavior modification, and most "parental involvement" efforts. In the second class are efforts to change students' learning environments, as through job training and classroom innovation. The norms that are affected by these efforts are those related to performance in school work and to classroom management. Those norms that arise from the social functioning of schools are largely ignored. Most projects either show little awareness of these norms or seem to take them for granted. Though the needs assessment of the Batesland, S. D. project demonstrates an understanding of problems related to schools' social functions, the actual project operation does not significantly address these problems.

These observations lead to a series of recommendations. School systems seeking to face the issue dropouts raise should identify the specific expectations in the school environment that dropouts are failing to meet. If these expectations prove to be unnecessary for educational achievement, a school system wishing to reduce its dropout rate should abandon them. Individual differences should be respected in practice, not just on paper. Students' procedural, political, and personal rights should be respected, and special services should be provided students with unique needs.

Further, school systems should become self-consciously aware of the social assumptions behind their expectations. This awareness should lead to a fundamental questioning of the idea that all students should stay in school until graduation. The evidence that high school graduation may not promote individual mobility must be faced, and a school system must ask if this is the only form of mobility that it should facilitate.

When deemed appropriate, a school system should remake its social functions. It should promote more forms of social mobility than just individual aspiration to middle class life. Included in these other forms are various modes of group mobility.

A fundamental issue becomes that of power. When the functioning of schools becomes destructive to many of the students they are charged with serving, it is necessary to return actual control of schools to their communities. Token "participation" is not control.

For the dropout phenomenon to be fully understood, further research is needed on the social functioning of specific school systems, on the relationship between schooling and social mobility, and on the effects of schooling on women.

II. LITERATURE ON DROPOUTS' COMMONALITIES

A paradox arises from discussions of dropping out. On the one hand, the purpose of many investigations of dropouts is to discover what they all tend to have in common, while on the other hand, much dropout literature concerns itself with what is unique in specific settings and for specific classes of dropouts. The tendency to seek what is common is evident in some studies of the "dropout problem" conducted by State boards of education. A common practice is to develop profiles of the "typical" dropout in those States. Intended as aids in the identification of students likely to drop out, these profiles amount to lists of attributes that dropouts tend to possess, as indicated by State-wide studies. The Louisiana State Department of Education, for example, constructed a "portrait of a typical dropout, 1967," based on measures of central tendency derived from survey results. This "typical dropout" "was a 16-year-old boy" who "dropped out of school in the tenth grade" and was "below-average in intelligence." Further:

> His parents had eight years but less than twelve years of schooling. . . . He was excessively absent from school. . . . He gave academic difficulty as the reason for leaving. . . . He was unable to find employment after leaving school.[1]

Youth in Transition

The reporting of the Youth in Transition study of male dropouts, too, lends itself to a reading that will emphasize the commonality of dropouts rather than their differences. Bachman's development of a series of predictors of educational attainment is a technique that highlights the likenesses among dropouts that his data reveal, but this technique might tend to obscure the fact--which his data demonstrate equally well--that there is great diversity within the population of dropouts. To display the relationships between his predictor variables and educational attainment, Bachman has constructed bar graphs of the weighted proportional distribution of his sample across the scales of his predictors. Each bar is broken into three sections, representing three levels of attainment: dropping out; graduating from high school; and entering post-secondary schooling. Some of these graphs are quite striking. For example, the message of the graph comparing rebellious behavior in school with educational attainment seems quite clear. The higher the level of rebelliousness, the greater the chance of dropping out and the less the chance of entering college.[1] This is the same theme that is sounded in the accompanying text:

---

[1] Hohmann, 1967, p. 21.

> . . . the pattern is essential linear, and fairly strong. Of those least rebellious in tenth grade (the ones who answered "never" to most questions), less than [sic] 7 percent became dropouts. At the other end of the scale, of those who "often" engaged in rebellious behavior in school, we estimate that nearly half (about 45 percent) dropped out. College entrance was also related to scores on this scale; the greater the level of rebellious behavior, the lower the likelihood of going to college.[2]

Yet the same set of numbers that supports this conclusion also demonstrates that a substantial proportion of dropouts exhibited very little rebellious behavior in school; some 38 percent of those tenth graders who would later drop out reported that they "seldom" or "never" engaged in such behavior.[1] While the comparable proportions of high school graduates who entered college and of those who did not are higher--53 and 66 percent, respectively--the fact remains that a substantial proportion were not rebellious.

---

[1] Bachman, et al., 1971, p. 70.

[2] Ibid., pp. 69 and 71.

Fundamentally, the difficulty suggested here is that a statement of even a highly significant relationship between a predictor characteristic and dropping out does not imply that all dropouts possess that characteristic, or even that it is valid to generalize that dropouts tend to possess that characteristic. Elsewhere, Bachman is careful himself to point out this fact. While there is a strong relationship between dropping out and coming from a broken home--Bachman writes that "dropping out of high school is about twice as likely among boys from broken homes"--there are "limits to the relationship" to be kept in mind:

> Does this mean that a boy from a broken home will probably become a dropout? No indeed . . ., the great majority of boys from broken homes do not drop out. And it would be equally mistaken to conclude that most dropouts are the product of broken homes: about two-thirds come from homes that are intact.[2]

There is a still more basic reason why a reading of Youth in Transition documents might create an innacurately strong impression of commonality among dropouts. Underlying the construction of a survey research variable is, if not the assumption, at least the hope that two individuals with identical scores will be fundamentally alike on that dimension for the purposes of the research at hand. A partial test of whether this is the case is the variable's utility as a predictor. Even if it is a very useful predictor, however, such a variable may not be of much use for other purposes, such as in the formulation of a national dropout policy. One of Bachman's most important variables, for example, is socioeconomic level. Through a series of questions developed from a similar set used in Project TALENT, Bachman sought information from sample members on:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 207. These computations are derived from weighted data on responding panel members.

[2] Ibid., pp. 31 and 33.

1. Father's occupational status.
2. Father's education.
3. Mother's education.
4. Possessions in the home.
5. Number of books in the home.
6. Number of rooms per person in the home.[1]

Bachman gave each of these six "parts" equal weight, and on the basis of his responses, each sample member was assigned a point on a linear scale.

The predictive power of the variable does not seem great enough to prove its validity, whether it is used to predict educational attainment or "full" employment. When socioeconomic level is combined through techniques of Multiple Classification Analysis with three other family background dimensions—family size, parental punitiveness, and broken home—only 19.3 percent of the variance in educational attainment is explained.[2]

---

[1] Bachman, et al., 1970, p. 11.

[2] Bachman, et al., 1971, p. 48.

Bachman's complete predictive model treats academic ability, school attitudes and performance, and personality and behavior as a set of predictive variables that together affect attainment two ways. They mediate some of the effect of family background, and they have some independent influence of their own. Even this model explains less than half the variance in attainment; it accounts for only 38 percent.[1]

Bachman's SEL variable is less powerful as a predictor for "full" employment. Combined with academic ability, it accounts for only 4.9 percent of the variance in employment, and if dropping out is added to the model as an intervening variable with some independent effect, only 6.3 percent of the variance in employment is explained. (Does the fact that Bachman's model explains such a small proportion of the variance in employment invalidate what he concludes from this model, that dropping out has very little independent effect on employment? Bachman argues that it does not, for two reasons. First, the failure to explain more than 6.3 percent of variance in employment is not because dropping out is badly measured. On the contrary, the validity of his measure of educational attainment is far greater than that of the other predictive variables in the model, approaching perfect validity. Therefore, a more powerfully predictive model might include a greater number of predictive variables and might measure some of the variables already present in this model more accurately, but dropping out, by itself, would still account for less than four percent of the total variance in employment. Second, since Bachman was able to separate out the causes of dropping out only imperfectly, even this four percent over-represents the independent effects of dropping out. Part of the four percent must represent other causal factors, for which dropping out may be merely symptomatic.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 97.

That Bachman's SEL variable is not a very powerful predictor within his models, in other than a relative sense, does not, of course, mean that it is invalid. Other reasons that his models are not more powerful than they are include the possibility that he has omitted other potentially powerful predictors or that other predictive variables he uses are not accurately measured. On the other hand, even if his measure of SEL had proven itself to have greater predictive power, it would still be of limited use to policymakers. If this variable had been a very powerful predictor, this fact would not imply that all persons with identical SEL scores would live in basically similar social situations or that their social standing would influence educational attainment through the same mechanisms. Rather, it would mean that the Youth in Transition staff had so simplified the reality of these persons' experiences as to cut successfully across their differences. Clearly enough, for some purposes, extracting what is common in this manner can be a very fruitful procedure, but for other purposes, it may be far more important to identify the differences.

For example, educators may find it useful to know that an Oglala Sioux eighth grade boy and his black contemporary in a segregated school in

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 142-144.

Houston's inner-city have scored identically on the SEL index. This knowledge may help to determine the likelihood that each will drop out. It may very be that knowing their fathers' occupational status, parents' education, and possessions and rooms in their homes will permit one to make a guess of how likely each is to stay, with the confidence that the two guesses will be equally accurate. But for other purposes, this knowledge will not be sufficient. If one's goal is to keep both students in school, or is the more basic goal of providing for the real educational needs of each, more knowledge will be needed. A far more particular understanding will be necessary of what "socioeconomic level" means in each particular case--of what the specific reality is that the survey research variable captures only generally. A more specific understanding will be necessary, too, of the nature of the interaction between SEL and educational attainment. Knowing that an "effect" exists will not be enough. It will be necessary to understand the mechanism of the effect, as it varies from particular situation to situation.

In the two examples above (both of which will be examined at greater length later in this paper), SEL--or the reality that this variable vaguely represents--can be demonstrated to operate differently. The low socioeconomic level of the Oglala Sioux student is one fact of a much greater phenomenon, which embraces, among other aspects, the history of Indian-white relationships in this country, the specific culture of the Oglala, and the institutions the federal government has devised for dealing with this country's Indian population. The mechanisms through which SEL affects educational attainment will involve, for example, the effects of a culture gap between the Oglala and the school, both as the school is the institution mediating between white and Indian societies and as the school is the locus of an institutionalized culture of its own. An education policy that comes to grips with a high dropout rate among the Oglala will, therefore, have to be based on a very subtle understanding of the relationship between the students and the school and on a very particular understanding of low socioeconomic level.

The meaning of low socioeconomic level will be significantly different for the Houston student. As will be discussed at greater length later in this paper, high dropout rates among blacks in segregated schools there have been related to the fact that their teachers, who lived in the isolated milieu of the city's middle class blacks, imposed a set of expectations on their students. The most important of these was that the students aspire to middle class life by rejecting their own backgrounds, as the teachers themselves had done. It would, then, be misleading to say that low socioeconomic level, per se, causes a high dropout rate. Rather, a complicated interaction between certain values students encounter in school and the influence of their home and community environments leads many students to leave before graduation. Education planners who would face the fact of a high dropout rate must understand the specific mechanism involved.

Thus such survey research as Bachman's, while it can yield much valuable information, does not in itself allow the construction of theories of social behavior. For the two inter-related reasons that Bachman's models are not sufficiently complicated and that they obscure some significant individual differences, his research is not a sufficient base for formulating answers to such crucial policy issues as what educational options students identified as potential dropouts should be provided or how the social patterns of schools might be changed in certain locales.

III. DROPOUTS' DIFFERENCES

There is a second body of literature, concerning differences that exist among dropouts. In general, this literature may be sorted into three classes: examinations of statistical data that focus not on the modal points but on the polar ends of bellshaped distribution curves; area-specific studies that emphasize what is unique to given locales; and conceptual speculations that are not tied to specific research results.

"Why Capable Students Drop Out"

An example of literature from this first class is Woollatt's review of some dropout literature, published in the Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, "Why Capable Students Drop Out." Most of his analysis is on data from the New York State Holding Power Study, a longitudinal study of high school students and withdrawals conducted between 1957 and 1960. The variable he examines is I.Q. test score. Score distributions by sex and grade the dropout left are:

NEW YORK STATE
HOLDING POWER PROJECT, 1957-1960[1]

I.Q.	No. of Dropouts						
	Grade			Sex		Total	
	10	11	12	M	F	No.	Pct.
130-139	---	2	3	3	2	5	0.3
120-129	2	7	17	19	7	26	1.6
110-119	39	74	49	93	69	162	10.2
100-109	109	167	135	214	197	411	25.8
90- 99	189	183	132	265	239	504	31.7
80- 89	163	108	53	190	134	324	20.3
70- 79	75	40	13	73	55	128	8.0
60- 69	13	15	4	23	9	32	2.0
50- 59	---	1	---	---	1	1	0.1
TOTAL	590	597	406	880	713	1593	100.0

---

[1] Woollatt, 1961, p. 5. (Table 4.)

A simple eye-balling of these numbers reveals some interesting facts (though, because of the design and time of the research, results must be seen as suggestive, not conclusive). First, a significant proportion of dropouts scored substantially over 100. Therefore, generalizations about dropouts' supposed low intelligence must be suspect. Second, the distribution curve is displaced upward over time. That is, the higher the grade in which a dropout left, the higher his I.Q. score was likely to be. This observation is consistent with Bachman's attempt to conceptualize educational attainment as a continuum, but it suggests that the idea can be taken farther. While Bachman treated attainment as a trichotomy--with the three divisions of dropouts; high school graduates not entering college; and graduates entering college--these data suggest significant differences among dropouts from grades 10, 11, and 12. Finally, I.Q. differences between male and female dropouts may be fairly subtle. The distribution of female dropouts may have less variance than the distribution of males, but no other difference is obvious.

Woollatt identifies some differences between dropouts above and below 110 in reasons indicated for leaving school. Both the dropout himself and his counselor were in each case asked to name the reason for leaving school, apparently by choosing one response from a given list. Among males, proportionately more high- than low-I.Q. dropouts indicated "Failure in subject(s)" or "Family needs income." Among females, more low-I.Q. dropouts indicated "Dislikes school," "Failure in subject(s)," "Prefers job to school," or "Wants own income," while more high-I.Q. dropouts indicated "Desires to marry."[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 7.

Counselors' perceptions did not coincide with the dropouts', but they do imply differences between I.Q. groups. In the reasons counselors assigned, more high-I.Q. males left for reasons of "Discipline," "Lack of effort," "Parental attitude--family situation," or "Emotional and social," and more low-I.Q. males left for reasons of "Dislikes school," "Lack of success," "Low ability," and "Overage for grade." On the other hand, counselors indicated that more high-I.Q. females left for the reasons "Dislikes school," "Parental attitude--family situation," or "Marriage related," while more low-I.Q. females left for the reasons "Lack of success," "Low ability," "Overage for grade," or "Emotional and social."[1]

For a number of reasons, the specific results Woollatt reports probably should not be trusted. His data come from only one State and are by now quite old, and, moreover, the methodology is clearly not sophisticated enough to unravel the web of causal factors that lead to a student's dropping out. Nonetheless, the results point toward the conclusion that there may be substantial differences among dropouts and that some of these differences may be expressed as differences between high- and low-I.Q. students or among dropouts leaving at different levels of high school. This present investigation has not uncovered other useful research into these specific differences.

Area-specific studies are numerous. They differ greatly, however, in their intent and methods. While some make use of sophisticated techniques of social analysis, others are little more than head counts of dropouts from school systems. The needs assessments or evaluation results of some ESEA Title VIII dropout prevention projects might be classified here, though in general their results have been of limited use. Some studies that identify local peculiarities will be examined in a later section of this paper.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 8.

"Dropouts--A Political Problem"

A useful example of the third class of literature is S. M. Miller's paper, "Dropouts--A Political Problem," for the December 1962 National Education Association conference on dropouts in Washington. Because Miller attempts to create a complete taxonomy of the varieties of the species called "dropout," his paper will be quoted at length. His primary division is between middle and lower class dropouts. He suspects (and, of course, considerable research supports this conclusion) that most dropouts are lower class, but the middle class dropout does exist in large numbers, and he is relatively unanalyzed and unresearched. Miller writes:

> The likelihood is that there is considerable variation among middle class dropouts. Three types seem to emerge: (a) the dropout with school-related emotional difficulties, (b) the emotionally disturbed dropout whose difficulties are not directly related to school, and (c) the dropout from a family which is economically marginal to the middle class. The latter type, I would guess, makes up the bulk of the middle class dropouts.[1]

He specifies four classes of low-income dropouts, "(a) school-inadequate, (b) school-rejecting, (c) school-perplexed, and (d) school-irrelevant":

---

[1] Miller, 1964, p. 13.

> The school-inadequate category refers to those who may have difficulty in completing school because of low intellectual functioning or disturbing emotional functioning. This category is probably much smaller than generally assumed.[1]

Of the "school-rejecting" dropout he writes:

> The second type of low income dropout is propelled by a push away from school. Not a few find school as presently conducted confining, unuseful, ego-destructive. [But] I doubt if most low income dropouts leave school because of pure dislike of it.[2]

Miller describes the experience of the "school-perplexed" dropout:

> For many low income youth and families, a complete and unrelieved rejection of school does not exist. We have to recognize that many come to school with some personal or family concerns about it but become perplexed, lost, and sometimes reactive against the school experience, ending up as dropouts.[3]

Miller guesses that the first two categories are small, the third [illegible] growing, but the fourth, the "school-irrelevant" dropouts, the largest:

> Many prospective dropouts never have expected to graduate—they have a job level in mind which does not require much education. Since they see education instrumentally, they are not interested in school as such, and the school's inability to interest them compounds the problem.[4]

Miller's analysis leads him to conclude that the primary focus of efforts to deal with the "dropout problem" should not be on the schools, least of all on keeping students in school, but rather on the employment experiences people face when they leave school, at whatever point. Further, he argues:

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[4] Ibid., p. 15.

> We should be aiming to make the problem of unemployment and unsatisfactory employment a problem of politics—of citizenship rights, of economic rights, of social rights.[1]

Instead of constructing a bag of attributes that dropouts are supposed to have in common, Miller has, then, conceived of different sets of dropouts, each presumably with its own identifying characteristics and each with different educational needs. His model is, of course, consistent with the notion that all dropouts might tend to have attributes in common, too--that their common alienation might find expression in some common forms of behavior. Nonetheless, his orientation is fundamentally different from that of those who seek to create dropout "profiles." Rather than seeking to unify the concept of "dropout," a process which would tend to lead to a unified "solution," he has sought to diversify it. His way of thinking would lead to a diversified set of strategies to keep pupils in school, if that were one's aim, or to the creation of a diversified set of educational institutions if one's goal were the more basic objective of meeting educational needs. Without necessarily accepting the specific categories he suggests, it is, therefore, possible to recognize that his thinking is on a higher level than that of those who seek only to describe "the typical dropout."

Miller's model, however, falls short of being a comprehensive theory of dropout behavior (not, of course, that creating a comprensive theory was his intention). His model does not attempt to explain the specific nature of the interaction between the dropout-prone individual and his school environment and the mechanisms through which the potential dropout becomes the actual dropout.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 24.

"Deviance in the Public School: An Interactional View"

Walter E. Schafer, in "Deviance in the Public School: An Interactional View," offers some theoretical notions that can become the outline of such a comprehensive theory, which will at once attempt to explain commonalities among dropouts and, in a more fundamental way than Miller's model, the ways in which they differ.

Schafer attempts to explain the social context and mechanisms of a series of behaviors that are likely to get a student in trouble in school. These behaviors would include various forms of rebelliousness, academic failure, absenteeism, and--at the most extreme edge--dropping out. What these behaviors have most fundamentally in common, Schafer argues, is that they are acts of deviance from the norms of the school. Deviance, however, is not an intrinsic quality of an act itself; an act is deviant only in relation to a specific set of norms, according to Schafer's analysis:

> The starting point of an interactional approach to deviance is the observation that there is nothing inherent in the act making it deviant. It becomes so only as a label is applied to it by others. This in turn happens when the act is defined as a violation of some social norm. . . .
>
> It [deviance] is the product of an exchange between an individual and some other individuals, who represent or claim to represent the interests and standards of a particular group. It is not properly to be seen simply as action engaged in by an individual, but rather as characteristic of an interaction between persons.[1]

---

[1] Schafer, 1967, pp. 51 and 52.

Schafer makes the a priori argument, which, of course, considerable research supports, that dropping out, whatever its specific nature, will very rarely be an isolated act. It will almost always be only the final act of a general pattern of deviant behavior (though deviance need not always end with dropping out). Schafer identifies four significant aspects of the deviant role. First, the role must be entered. The deviant must be so labeled. Having violated the norms of his school, a student to become a deviant must be publicly identifed as a transgressor, whether through the application of sanctions (as formal disciplinary action or more subtle social sanctions) or through the provision of "treatment." The two crucial points in Schafer's analysis, then, are: first, that the transgressing student does not become a deviant unless the norms he violates are enforced and, second, that this norm enforcement is not necessarily punishment. It may be accomplished through such relatively benign action as assigning a student to a "remedial" class. In either case, it is publicly confirmed that he has violated school norms.

This analysis of role entry suggests two dilemmas in dealing with a student who violates norms. The first dilemma is between norm enforcement and confirming the student's status as an outsider. Though the ignoring of norm violation, Schafer argues, may lead to a loss of social control, enforcing norms will push students into deviant roles, which will confirm their position as altogether outside the norms. The second dilemma, closely related to the first, is between early identification and early confirmation of the deviant identity. If a student is identified as a potential dropout, he may receive remedial treatment to help him perform better in school. But he will thereby become identified as a deviant, and this may become a self-fulfilling prophecy; the provision of treatment, by identifying him as outside school norms, may make it more likely that he will drop out.

The second aspect of the deviant role that Schafer identifies is the differential response of schools to deviance. As already discussed, the response may lie anywhere on the spectrum of extreme punitiveness to special efforts to help. It is a fairly complicated matter, Schafer suggests, to predict how a school will react, because it depends on much more than simply what the violated norms were:

> . . . What happens to a student once he is defined as a deviant depends not only on what he did, but also on who he is, what his past record is, who saw and judged him, and where it occurred.[1]

The effects of school responses--the third aspect Schafer discusses--likewise vary from case to case. Schafer believes there to be three internal factors that make it likely for a student to behave in ways his school will find objectionable, and, he argues, unless the school's response is appropriate to the particular factor involved, the result may be the opposite of what is intended:

> . . . There are three individual (or internal) factors that may result in behavior or performance likely to be defined as unacceptable by the school: low innate capability, low commitment to school goals, and low acquired capabilities.
>
> In order to be maximally effective in alleviating or heading off future deviant behavior, social responses must not only control, contain, or cut off immediate deviant behavior, but must also develop commitment or acquired capabilities, as the case may be.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 55 and 56.

In other words, if a deviant with "low commitment to school goals" were assigned to a remedial reading class more appropriate to a deviant with "low acquired capabilities," control of the deviance would not likely be achieved; indeed, the situation may be made worse.

Finally, there is the problem of role exit. The greatest problem to be faced, Schafer suggests, is that once the label of deviance is acquired it may be impossible to shed.

A statement of the sets of norms that Schafer identifies as operating within schools has so far been postponed. These sets are: required attendance; academic performance; and standards of conduct.[1] It is easy enough to see how his assumption of these sets of norms has influenced his analysis, as in his identification of internal factors likely to lead to deviance. It is our contention that Schafer's analysis provides a very valuable framework for understanding the phenomenon of dropping out, but that it suffers from some important limitations, one of the most significant of which is that he takes far too narrow a view of the norms that operate within schools. The discussion that follows is an attempt to identify other areas of norms that operate within schools, to fit some particular dropout studies into an expanded notion of social deviance, and to differentiate among dropouts on the basis of the different sets of norms from which they deviate and the different mechanisms through which their deviance operates.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 52.

IV. NORMS OF THE SCHOOL

The existing literature on the functioning of schools permits the identification of two general areas of norms: those that reflect supposed requirements for the institutional functioning of schools and those that reflect the broader social context of schools. In the first area are norms requiring success in meeting curricular demands and those that reflect the requirements for convenient administration of classrooms and schools. To meet the demand for success in course work, a student needs to be fairly competent in certain mental and physical skills. A physical or mental handicap or a lack of acquired skills could, therefore, force a student into the role of deviant. The process by which a student fails academically and becomes labeled an outsider is, however, likely to be fairly complicated and to vary greatly among schools. There is evidence, for example, that many of our schools are perfectly capable of certifying barely literate young people as high school graduates if they have simply sat more or less quietly through twelve years of school. In these cases, since the school apparently does not enforce norms relating to academic performance, the students do not become defined as deviants.

The possession of a certain amount of competence, however, is not the only quality necessary for successful academic performance. To succeed in a history course, for example, a student must not only be smart and literate enough to read and understand a textbook, but he must also be able and willing to submit to the form of teaching he receives. He must accept that learning history means memorizing dates, places, and lists of "causes" for historical events--or, if his history course is more innovative, he must have the initiative to pursue an independent study project. To satisfy his school's norms for academic achievement, a student must not only be basically competent in the skills demanded of him, but he must also adapt himself to the specific modes of instruction of his classes. There is a breed of dropout to whom researchers have given but little attention, the intellectual dropout. His numbers are probably quite small, but he does exist. He most likely has dropped out because of an unwillingness to submit to a mode of instruction that he sees as silly or demeaning. In some quarters, he has achieved the status of a folk-hero.[1]

The administrative functioning of classrooms and schools has given rise to a set of norms for students' behavior that is probably at least as important as the norms related purely to curriculum. A major weakness of Schafer's analysis is that, except for required attendance and "proper behavior," which he seems not to see defined by institutional imperatives, he ignores this area of institutional expectations altogether. Yet there is evidence that the norms that regulate behavior for the purpose of school and classroom management affect students at least as profoundly as do norms relating to academic achievement. Some data from the Youth in Transition study are interesting in this regard. In connection with their other data gathering, Bachman's associates questioned students and teachers on what they thought the functions of schools ideally should be and on what they perceived the functions actually to be, as their schools were currently administered. Students' responses indicated that they felt that their schools gave more weight to managing student behavior than to such other values as instilling a desire to learn or promoting competitive athletics. Johnston and Bachman write:

---

[1] See, for example, the essay "The Year 3000," written by Pat Dunkel, who is such a dropout, in Marc Libarle and Tom Seligson, eds., The High School Revolutionaries. New York: Random House, 1970, pp. 267-275.

> It is rather disillusioning to find that students see the maintenance of order and quiet in the school as the top priority of administrators and teachers.[1]

A sizable body of literature exists detailing the administrative restrictions on life in school. One of the most cogent analyses is by Philip Jackson, currently Director of the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago, who, as a psychologist, carefully observed the operation of elementary school classrooms and analyzed the institutional imperatives that dictated behavior. There are two reasons why we believe that an analysis of elementary classrooms is appropriate to a discussion of high school dropouts. First, almost every high school student is an ex-elementary school student. Both the analysis of social deviance we have presented and such research as the Youth in Transition study suggest that dropping out is only one act in a well-established pattern of behavior, whose roots likely go back at least into the dropout's elementary school years. The deviant in the school system likely entered that role, we argue, even before he entered high school. Second, much of Jackson's analysis pertains directly to high school classrooms. Certainly there are differences between the two, as in the fact that a high school student attends several classes and receives several teachers' instruction, and a movement towards high school innovations possibly exists. Nonetheless, the "three facts of life" in classrooms that Jackson identifies, of "crowds, praise, and power,"[1] are, it will be apparent, fundamental to the operation of a classroom, whether at the elementary or high school level.

---

[1] Johnston and Bachman, 1972, p. 9.

Setting the context for Jackson's analysis of classrooms is the fact that the school experience is compulsory:

> There is an important fact about a student's life that teachers and parents often prefer not to talk about, at least not in front of students. This is the fact that young people have to be in school whether they want to be. . . . the school child, like the incarcerated adult, is, in a sense, a prisoner. He too must come to grips with the inevitability of his experience. He too must develop strategies for dealing with the conflict that frequently arises between his natural desires and interests on the one hand and institutional expectations on the other.[2]

The fact of compulsion arises at least in part from the societal expectation that schools be custodial institutions for young people. Johnston and Bachman, for example, identify this function of social control as one of the three basic demands society makes of schooling,[3] and the idea of "school-as-babysitter" has been a theme common to much recent critical literature. Students are required to be in school and not simply so that they can be taught but also for the independent purpose of keeping them under physical control.

---

[1] Jackson, 1968, p. 10.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[3] Johnston and Bachman, 1972, pp. 1-3.

James Coleman believes that this function of schools is growing in importance. As the home and family have declined as centers of adult activity, and as the young have been more and more excluded from the workplace, he argues, the demand for custodial institutions for young people has increased. This function has extended down into day-care centers and up into colleges, junior colleges, and universities.[1] Young people are thus in schools because society has found nowhere else for them to be and because they are not trusted to be on their own. Young people, confined and distrusted, therefore cannot easily escape the expectations they encounter in school. This fact is the basis of much of the school's power to enforce norms of behavior.

The first fact of classroom life that Jackson discusses is crowds. A teacher must manage in a crowded condition with only limited resources. The necessity of the situation therefore demands that the teacher assume the role of a "combination traffic cop, judge, supply sergeant, and time-keeper."[2] Line-forming of various sorts are inevitable, and delay cannot be avoided. In fact, successful pupils are the most likely to experience certain kinds of delay, such as waiting after the completion of a quiz or a writing assignment for the rest of the class to be through and for another activity to commence. Denial of impulse is also necessary if a student is to accommodate himself to the demands of classroom scheduling. He must tolerate beginning an activity before he is interested and leaving it before his interest is gone. Further, he must be able to isolate himself in a crowd, to ignore the distractions of his fellow students in order to work as an individual on assigned tasks. Therefore, a basic institutional expectation is that he be patient: "The quintessence of virtue in most institutions is contained in the single word: patience."[1] Accompanying the idea of patience is the virtue schools make of the ability to deny impulse; classroom management demands that students disengage their feelings from their actions, then re-engage them when institutionally appropriate.

---

[1] Coleman, 1972, pp. 6-7.

[2] Jackson, 1968, p. 13.

When he calls praise a fact of school life, Jackson is referring to the pervasiveness of evaluation. The primary source of the evaluations is the teacher, though other students may often join in, and these external evluations may be mirrored in self-judgment. Some evaluations are secret, as I.Q. or personality test results, but most others involve public identification. The referents of evaluations include educational achievement, adjustments to institutional expectations, and the possession or absence of specific character traits. The quality of an evaluation may be anywhere on the spectrum of extremely bad to extremely good, though there is a growing bias in favor of the use of reward, rather than punishment, as the primary means of social control in classrooms. Nonetheless, evaluation is continuous and omnipresent, touching nearly every area of school activity and coloring nearly every personal relationship. The importance of the evaluations, even their supposed power to determine the quality of the student's adult life, is constantly impressed upon him. The school thus demands of students three rather difficult and sometimes conflicting jobs: that they strive to earn praise and avoid punishment; that they publicize positive and conceal negative evaluations; and that they satisfy the demands of two groups, teachers and their peers. Further, evaluative systems in schools require that students abandon the ideal of "intrinsic" motivation, since there often is no intrinsic reason to conform to the institutional demands contained in the evaluative systems.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.

The third fact that students must face in schools is the overwhelming power of the authority figures within the institution. The student, whether in high school or elementary school, is required to give deference to relative strangers who wield power that has crucial personal significance. Unlike parental authority, a teacher's authority is as much proscriptive as restrictive; the student, to remain within the norms of his school, must meet the demands of an external authority system that requires work of him for which he may experience no intrinsic motivation. And, unlike a paid worker, he has no right to quit--until his sixteenth birthday. Jackson identifies two types of "interpersonal maneuvering" that develop within a system of such grossly unequal power: the seeking of special favors and the hiding of words and deeds that would displease authorities.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

Lawrence Kohlberg, whose research into the development of modes of ethical thinking has led him to examine the operation of social norms within classrooms, offers an anecdote that illustrates how the requirements of classroom management may grow in the minds of students into full-blown moral imperatives.

A second grade pupil announced at home "that he did not want to be one of the bad boys in school":

> When asked "Who were the bad boys?" he replied, "The ones who don't put their books back where they belong and get yelled at."[1]

Thus, to avoid becoming a deviant from the school society a student must conform to a series of norms that arise from the requirements of convenient management of classrooms. When an individual, because of his own peculiarities or because of the qualities his own culture defines as virtues, is unable to submit himself to these requirements, the school system will likely brand him a deviant, making him a prime candidate for dropping out--whether or not schooling would help him pursue the kinds of life he may want to lead, whether or not he could make constructive use of educational resources if available within another context.

The second broad area of norms that we have identified contains those sets of norms that exist within schools because schools do not exist in social vacuums. Teachers and administrators bring certain moral expectations with them into the schools. Whether these expectations are culturally derived or are the product of personal history, teachers and administrators do expect the students to abide by certain norms that may not be at all necessary for academic success. Of course, many of these norms will arouse little or no controversy. Teachers may simply hope that their students possess such virtues as loyalty, moral courage, and friendliness. In other cases, however, the moral expectations of school personnel may not be so free from controversy, and the sanctions enforced for their violation may be very destructive of the lives of students. The Task Force on Children Out of School reports that Boston city schools routinely exclude women students who become pregnant. They persist in this practice despite opposition from medical experts, despite the fact that most of these women wish to remain in school, and despite the fact that their exclusion is clearly illegal. The Task Force concludes that the reason for the practice is that school personnel experience moral revulsion at the thought of unmarried women becoming pregnant. Their verbalizations about the matter express the impulse to make an outcast of the deviant; they speak of not wanting the pregnant woman around because she will "contaminate" the other students and of the need to punish her for her transgression.[1]

---

[1] Kohlberg and Turiel, 1971, p. 410.

Further, the fact that schools exist in social contexts means that students themselves develop norms for their fellow students. A large body of literature exists describing and analyzing the operation of adolescent society, both in and out of school. Great regional and other variations no doubt exist in the norms of this society.

---

[1] Task Force on Children Out of School, 1970, pp. 32-33.

Though little hard evidence exists on the matter, it is reasonable to believe that some students drop out because they have become deviants from an adolescent society whose locus is the school.

In addition, schools have social functions, usually related to the process of socializing. These functions will themselves generate norms for student behavior.

In the section that follows, a number of studies of specific locales are examined from the standpoint of the social deviance model of dropping out. A recurring theme is that school systems that attempt to acculturate members of sub-cultures into American middle class life, holding out this acculturation as the only form of constructive environmental adaptation will suffer from very high dropout rates.

V. STUDIES OF SPECIFIC LOCALES

The Prediction of Dropout Behavior Among Urban Negro Boys

H. A. Bullock's study of dropouts from segregated, all-black schools in Houston, Texas focuses on the way in which students became stay-ins or dropouts for reasons of their ability or inability to meet the expectations they encountered, particularly in regard to social mobility. He followed through junior and senior high school 795 males who entered seventh grade in September, 1958. By August, 1964, three had died, one was physically unable to attend, and 394 were classed as voluntary withdrawals.[1] His central idea

> is that dropout behavior, growing out of the differential responses of children to their school environment, is a form of educational maladjustment experienced by those who encounter school demands in excess of their social-cultural preparations to meet them.[2]

We would disagree on conceptual grounds with the tone of Bullock's language, which suggests that dropping out occurs when a student fails to adjust to his school. We would prefer saying that the student and the institution have not found a common ground or that the institution has not adjusted to the student. Nonetheless, Bullock's analysis is essentially consistent with the ideas of social deviance we have presented here. While Bullock does not expound on the dynamics of "educational maladjustment," we believe that Schafer's idea of deviance is essentially the same notion and that Schafer's analysis of the social processes that describe deviance applies.

---

[1] Bullock, 1967, p. 29.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

Bullock states that his "model is a simple one":

> Each American child who enters school finds himself in an arena of pressure expectations. Each, too can be expected to carry some kind of preparation for dealing with this pressure. The responses each makes to this stimulus situation that is highly personal in nature become differentiated as related to his preparation. Where this preparation is adequate, a child can be expected to meet the demands of his school environment with enough efficiency to avoid the tensions of maladjustment and the accompanying symptoms of dropout behavior. Where it is not adequate, one can predict that he will experience educational maladjustment and subsequent withdrawal from school. A child's educational destiny is shaped by prior conditions that prevail long before he enters high school.[1]

Again, Bullock seems to be taking the nature of the school environment for granted, when he in effect places the entire responsibility for "adjustment" on the student. Whether this attitude derives from the reluctance of a professional sociologist to act upon the world he is studying or from a conviction that significant change is a practical impossibility, we would argue for a different orientation.

One set of expectations, or norms, that Bullock identifies was a formalized code regulating behavior. Part of this code would correspond to the institutional demands in Jackson's analysis, particularly those regulations that demanded respect for school authority, routines, and property. Parts of it prohibited fighting among students, and "almost inflexible regulations were imposed in the area of sex behavior."[2] The most important and severe expectations, however, were informal and uncodified and came from the teachers. As Bullock describes these expectations, they related to a system "characteristic of American society" of conformity socialization into the dominant culture. The salient traits of this system of socialization are that it demands aspiration to middle class status through the rejection of the milieu to which one was born, that what must be absorbed for the child to be socialized depends but little on the individual himself, and that the socializing agents operate on the principle of control through an external network of reward and punishment rather than through intrinsic motivation.[1]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 14.

[2] Ibid., p. 34.

The most important norms, then, by which teachers judged their students arose from the expectation that the students would aspire for individual mobility, in a rather narrow sense of that expression:

> Guided more by the aim of acculturation than enculturation—aspiring more to make pupils like Americans in general than the people of their subculture in particular—the teachers had unconsciously installed a system of expectations that rejected the traditional colored world. . . .[2]

The idea is not just that students were expected to aspire to economic mobility. Though this was part of the expectation, they were moreover expected to reject the sub-culture into which they had been born and to conform to the life patterns of middle class America.

Bullock sees several reasons for these expectations. The teachers' parents were likely to have come to Houston from rural Texas in search of better schools and more stable environments for their children. As they grew up, the future teachers were encouraged to aspire to the middle class themselves, and high school and college graduation, followed by securing teaching positions, became the means. To the teachers, being black and middle class meant separating themselves from the rest of the black community in Houston:

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 11.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 36.

> Practically all of them had confined their personal associates to people who composed the "thin upper crust" of Negro Houston; they resided, as they still do, in the better or more exclusive residential areas available to Negroes in the city; and, as indicated by the voluntary associations to which they belonged, were noticeably set apart from the class level out of which most of them had originated.[1]

Thus, the teachers were expecting their pupils to follow the path they themselves had trod. A second, related reason that Bullock reports is that the teachers felt that parents had ceded them the major responsibility for the growth of their students. The teachers believed that through lack of sufficient involvement in their children's education, the parents had turned the children over to them. (In other studies reported below, however, students were found to encounter very similar expectations, though their teachers had not been born into the students' sub-culture.)

Stay-ins and dropouts thus identified themselves by their ability or inability to meet these teacher expectations. Bullock observes that teachers had little tolerance for failure to meet their expectations. Though they recognized that many students' backgrounds would not prepare them to conform to the norms the teachers established, they did not feel they were being unrealistic, for their argument was not that all students would bring this preparation with them to school, but that all students should. The schools' high dropout rate, then, can hardly be surprising. Bullock reports that dropping out was essentially an act of escape from pressure to conform to impossible norms. Yet most of the students were somewhat ambivalent--they "tried to eat their cake and have it, too" by trying "to attend occasionally and yet remain in good standing." But this strategy failed, since their frequent absence provoked administrative sanctions, which precipitated their withdrawal.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

Warrior Dropouts

As Rosalie H. Wax reports the situation, on the basis of four years of study as an anthropologist, the phenomenon of very high dropout rates among Oglala Sioux from the Pine Ridge reservation in South Dakota can be attributed to conflicts between the expectations of the Indians' culture and the expectations they encounter in school. In this regard, she writes, the situation in Pine Ridge is quite like the situation in urban slums:

> In slum schools and Pine Ridge schools scholastic achievement is low, and the dropout rate is high; the children's primary loyalties go to friends and peers, not schools or educators; and all of them are confronted by teachers who see them as inadequately prepared, uncultured offspring of alien and ignorant folk. They are classified as "culturally deprived." All such schools serve as the custodial, constabulary, and reformative arm of one element of society directed against another.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 61 and 62.

[2] R. H. Wax, 1967, p. 40.

The most salient feature of rearing boys in the Sioux culture is the reliance after infancy on other boys their own age or only slightly older for caretaking, social control, and socializing. One result of this practice is the development of very strong peer group loyalties, which are often at odds with the institutional demands of schools. As Wax describes how this conflict works out, however, it seems that the Indians win the battle in the elementary schools. Peer group activities dominate the schools, sometimes even overwhelming the operation of classrooms, whether by overt disruption or, more frequently, by unanimous withdrawal from classroom activities. At this level, most students seem to like school, because it is the locus of social life. Truants tend to be those students who are rejected by their peers. (This fact is evidence of the class of dropouts who are deviants from the norms of their peer group within school.)

The greater demands of high school, especially when attendance means travelling great distances to a boarding school, however, are too much for many an adolescent Sioux. The virtues his culture has taught him to express make him ill-fitted to the norms he will encounter in school--to both the administrative norms Jackson analyzed and to the cultural norms of the elements of American society that control his schools:

> By the time he has finished eighth grade, the country Indian boy has many fine qualities: zest for life, curiosity, pride, physical courage, sensibility to human relationships, experiance with the elemental facts of life, and intense group loyalty and integrity. . . .

> But, on the other hand, the country Indian is almost completely lacking in the traits most highly valued by the school authorities: a narrow and absolute respect for "regulations," "government property," routine, discipline, and diligence. He is also deficient in others skills apparently essential to rapid and easy passage through high school and boarding school--especially the abilities to make short-term superficial adjustments with strangers. Nor can he easily adjust to a system which demands, on the one hand, that he study competitively as an individual, and, on the other, that he live in barrack-type dormitories where this kind of study is impossible.[1]

A large proportion of the Sioux cannot survive this overwhelming conflict and drop out. Interviews with dropouts indicate two distinct responses. Some students, apparently those who take the demands of school most seriously and who consequently suffer most from the gap between school and their own culture, report feeling lonely, alienated, and hurt by the experience. The other group deny by their actions the validity of the school's expectations and retain allegiance to the values of their peer group. These are "hell-raisers," who enjoy school by engaging in pranks that the school administration defines as delinquency--until they are caught and expelled. It is interesting to note that most of those Oglala Sioux who make it through high school, including those who later become teachers in the school system, boast of their hell-raising, too, but see as the main difference between themselves and these pushouts the fact that they were never caught.

Untapped Good

Norman M. Chansky's account is of a Department of Labor-funded job training program for dropouts in North Carolina, called Operation Second Chance. It is interesting for the insights it provides on how the expectations of the community in which an individual lives can determine his reaction to his failure to abide by the norms of schooling. The program operated three training sites, on the Coastal Plain, in the Piedmont, and in the Appalachian Mountains in the west of the State. The success of the site in the Piedmont, in terms of numbers of trainees succeeding in the course and obtaining employment, far outshone that of the other two sites. Chansky attributes this fact to the different reactions of the communities in the three areas to failure, as defined by school norms.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 41.

The dominant attitude in the East, Chansky reports, was one of defeat and hopelessness:

> . . . the dropout in the East finds himself psychologically outside of the community. Because of so many roadblocks to self-improvement, he gives up. When his being is threatened--as well it is when he is hungry and out of work, he leaves the community to protect himself.[1]

In a sense, the community has no expectations of him. Having failed in the terms of school, there is no alternative way for him to succeed, and his alienation and discouragement become complete. Such a dropout is not likely to complete a training program.

The position of the mountain dropout within his community is just the opposite. His position and self-esteem are well-established, apart from whether he succeeds in high school or not, since they are derived primarily from the land off which he lives. "There is little he can do to invite community wrath. Rarely will he have to excel or achieve in order to gain additional status."[2] With this secure an [illegible], environment, the sanctions that his high school could impose for violating its norms could cause him little anxiety. Likewise, he experiences little or no pressure to succeed in a job training program. Receiving the stipend for a time may be convenient, but whether he completesthe course or not he is likely to consider a matter of indifference.

---

[1] Chansky, 1966, pp. 126-27.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 127.

The position of the Piedmont dropout is quite a bit different from that of either of these two. His community seems by and large to have shared the expectations of school; dropping out is viewed as a personal failure. However, he is not irrevocably doomed to the role of deviant; Chansky describes him as having "one foot . . . in the community, one foot . . . out."[1] He has the opportunity to regain community acceptance by proving himself, and successfully completing a job training program is a satisfactory way to accomplish this.

"Indians, Hillbillies, and the 'Educational Problem'"

The anthropologists Robert K. Thomas and Albert L. Wahrhaftig examine the social functions of schools for the Cherokee and "folk Anglo-Saxon" inhabitants of eastern Oklahoma. They argue that schools initially developed within each group to perform specific functions necessary for group survival but that various forces have subverted these functions and resulted in schools whose expectations inevitably alienate great numbers of young people and produce each year a large crop of dropouts. Before 1907, the eastern Oklahoma Ozarks were part of the Cherokee Nation, and today some 12,000 Cherokee live there,

---

[1] *Ibid.*

9,500 of these in small, Cherokee-speaking settlements. Living interspersed among the Indians are rural white communities, whose ancestors either moved illegally into the Nation during the 1890's or intermarried with Indians. Though they are commonly called "Okies" or "hillbillies," Thomas and Wahrhaftig prefer naming this group folk Anglo-Saxons. Though quite distinct, these two groups have been similarly failed by the education system supposedly designed to serve them. In conventional formulations, their "educational problems" are similar: both populations have very low levels of education and high dropout rates, among the highest in the country, though in both these measures the Cherokee are worse off than the whites.

Through various points in their history, Thomas and Wahrhaftig argue, the Cherokee developed independent education institutions to meet threats of tribal extinction. Early contact with advancing whites frequently resulted in the destruction of entire Cherokee villages--often in reprisal for rash raids, uncontrollable by the tribe, against the whites' encroachments on Cherokee lands. Because specialists in certain tribal functions were being killed before their apprentices were trained, the continuity of Cherokee culture was threatened. It was in response to this environmental demand, Thomas and Wahrhaftig believe, that Sequoyah developed the Cherokee syllabary. Through the medium of a written language, gravely endangered traditions could be preserved. The introduction of the syllabary sparked a rash of innovation, including the establishment of universal schooling, and within a few years nearly universal literacy was achieved.

Education, too, became the means by which the Cherokee attempted to counter the challenges of the expanding white world. At first, they attempted to educate, even in white schools, an elite among themselves, who would have the professional skills, as in law, necessary for tribal defense. When, however, it became apparent that the members of this elite were finding the allures of the white world too enticing and were foresaking the Cherokee tribal concept, this strategy was abandoned. A system of Cherokee institutions in which English as a second language was taught was established instead, and the Indians thus trained a professional class themselves. Encroachments by the federal government and the State of Georgia, in spite of the Indians' efforts at defense, led to the splintering of the coalition of interests that had governed the Cherokee and to the forced resettlement of the population. Even so, reliance continued on superb education for meeting environmental demands.

Finally, Thomas and Wahrhaftig state, the schools became dominated by mixed-blood groups whose goals were the promotion of a kind of super-Americanism and the abandonment of the ideal of tribal preservation. Alienation of the Cherokee from their schools followed, and the end result was the Indians' present powerlessness and isolation from the school system charged with meeting their needs.

Thomas and Wahrhaftig see similarities between the Indians' experience and that of the folk Anglo-Saxons. The folk Anglo-Saxon man was an expander of frontiers. Such a man would move west to keep "one jump ahead of the Establishment," for he elected "to make life for himself and his family an individual creation":

> This kind of man, a seeker of the good life, strong-minded, a pirate, an authoritarian within his home, a macho, and often enough an outlaw, settled in the hills of eastern Oklahoma, wherever the Cherokees left a hollow unpopulated.[1]

There the folk Anglo-Saxons built kin-based communities and relied on certain social institutions for community preservation, the most important of which was the school. Thomas and Wahrhaftig assign two functions to the schools. First, the folk Anglo-Saxons, not unlike the Cherokee, expected schooling to prepare the young to deal with hostile forces in their environment, including bankers and lawyers in town. The greater education and sophistication of teachers, then, did not set the teachers apart from the community but made them community resources, "telling country folk what people in town have 'up their sleeve' and acting as spokesmen for the interests of the rural community."[2]

The primary function of schools, then, was defensive. The secondary function was to serve as part of the mechanism of socializing. In particular, the schools were uniquely well suited to mediating the conflicting expectations of a child's mother and father. While fathers typically wanted their children to become head-strong, daring, and fiercely independent, womenfolk sought to develop gentleness and docility and to rid their offspring of the curse of wanderlust. Social continuity depended on the resultion of this conflict, yet the strains accompanying it could disrupt the structure of the home. The existence of schools permitted the displacement of the conflict. It was there, instead of in the home, that children could be instilled with the qualities deemed necessary for community stability. There they would be made to "work hard," and there they would receive "discipline." What was essential for functioning of schools in the view of the folk Anglo-Saxons was, therefore, that they belong to the community--not be the creature of "the Establishment."

---

[1] Thomas and Wahrhaftig, 1971, p. 240.

[2] Ibid., p. 242.

In the 1930's the amount of education the Cherokee and the folk Anglo-Saxon received was similar to today, but then no "education problem" was recognized. "Today," however,

> Oklahoma has a full-blown "education problem," but the rough outlines of regional life are not that greatly changed, nor are new skills necessary for living there successfully. . . . Over these decades, it is the requirements for status and social mobility that have most changed, and the newly formulated expectation that "education" will confer both. Completion of education is equated with arrival in the middle class. But, although many academic critics of our educational system overlook the point, this was no less true in 1930. What is new is the expectation that all youngsters must arrive in the middle class by completing their education, along with the new requirements for class mobility to which schools are tailored.[1]

This radical change in the function of the schools, then, has itself become the "education problem" in eastern Oklahoma, in Thomas and Wahrhaftig's view. They are not, however, arguing "Sitwell's Fallacy," "that the poor are happier in their station in life and should be left to enjoy it."[1] Rather, they are arguing that the schools in eastern Oklahoma have come under the exclusive control of the middle class and that this fact, along with related social developments, has destroyed schools' previous functions and caused many formally viable mechanisms of social mobility to wither away and has drastically narrowed the terms of this mobility.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

Formerly, there was a reciprocity in the relationships between town and country, and rich and poor. Partly because of ties of kinship between town and country people, neither fully had the upper hand, and the country people often set the expectations for the system. Economic mobility was possible through a variety of means. Ladders of occupations existed, which folk Anglo-Saxons and Cherokees alike could climb without relinquishing the right to define their own terms of existence. Whole kin groups could aspire to collective mobility through a variety of strategies, such as resource pooling to sponsor an eldest son, who would then raise the economic level of the whole group. This and other strategies could be accomplished without rejecting one's identification with his sub-culture.

Since the 1930's, however, the country groups have lost their former power. New arrivals in the towns have lacked kin ties to the country, and dependence on State and federal governments, such as for cash flow into the local economies, has grown. A result of these developments has been that mobility has come to mean entering the middle class on its own terms. The growth of service industries, at the expense of what was traditionally considered productive labor, has contributed, too, to the fact that mobility now means transforming oneself, since "correct behavior" is becoming more highly valued than productivity. Meanwhile, the schools have been taken over by the middle class. State and federal control over budgets has increased, county superintendents have become responsible to the state legislature rather than to community boards, teachers have become a corporate group, not simply specialized community members, and the consolidation movement has pulled schools out of communities.

---

[1] See Friedenberg, 1964, p. 38.

In sum, a set of complementary forces has created a situation in which the Cherokee and folk Anglo-Saxons are expected to aspire to middle class status on its own terms by rejecting the validity of their own backgrounds, and the schools have become the agents of this transformation. Students find that they must redefine who they are if they are to survive in schools:

> The person that they are is unacceptable (what harried executive would purchase insurance from a salesman wearing cover-alls, rolling his own cigarettes, and speaking hayseed English?). Including Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons within the prospering class of the region demands the construction, from them, of acceptable persons. To the schools has been entrusted this act of creation.[1]

In another sense, too, the terms of mobility have been radically limited:

> Since the middle class is an aggregate of individuated people who conceive of success as the result of individual goal-oriented self-improvement, it does not occur to them

---

[1] Thomas and Wahrhaftig, 1971, pp. 245-46.

> to provide opportunities whereby entire communities of people may improve their collective rank, nor do "deviant" communities of Cherokees and folk Anglo-Saxons have sufficient power to demand this concession. Thus, to all but mobile individuals, the system has closed.[1]

The norms that the Cherokee or folk Anglo-Saxon child will encounter in his school, then, will require him to accept the idea of his own unworthiness before he cansatisfy them. That a great many of them drop out can hardly be surprising. Thomas and Wahrhaftig, in noticing that Cherokees tend to drop out when they encounter a predominantly middle class environment for the first time, suggest that their dropping out shows what they have learned:

> Significantly, the Cherokee dropout rate reaches its peak at the point at which students transfer from backwoods schools, where they are a majority, to consolidated high schools, where town middle-class students are the majority. Perhaps, then, since for these students the school is a middle-class environment, dropping out represents not failure but learning. Perhaps there is a lesson to be learned from the image these students have constructed of their environment. And perhaps the lesson that students are learning is that the middle-class-as-environment does not permit itself to be dealt with when a community strictly demands that its children be educated but not transformed.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 247.

VI. PUSHOUTS

If dropping out is the final act in a pattern of deviance from the social system called the high school, then it makes sense to believe that some dropping out is at the initiative of the student and that some is the result of sanctions enforced by the school. Students who are thus pushed from school may or may not be actually expelled or otherwise overtly ejected. There is evidence, mostly informal, that schools deliberately employ such strategies as exerting various kinds of pressure on students deemed undesirable until they "voluntarily" withdraw. For obvious reasons, this practice is not well publicized by the schools involved. There is therefore little documentation except by anecdote, though it may be quite a wide-spread practice. There is little research on the results of specific disciplinary practices and less still on the results of different school-wide disciplinary systems. Langenbach and Letchworth cite the paucity of information in this area.[1]

Most information on the question of pushouts comes from sources with less than clinical objectivity—from individuals and organizations who see many ejections as abridgements of students' rights.

"Schools for Scandal"

Ira Glasser, Associate Director of the New York Civil Liberties Union, writes of cases in which schools have expelled students in violation, in his view, of procedural, First Amendment, and personal rights. In the cases he cites, students clearly enough have become deviants from schools through acts, some of them with political connotations, in violation of schools' norms. Glasser observes the fact, which we have so far ignored, that schools exist in a legal as well as in a social context, and that, therefore, there are limitations in law on the social functioning of schools. His concern is with schools that perform their social functions in violation of the law. To make this point, he compares schools with the military:

---

[1] Langenbach and Letchworth, 1971, p. 1.

> There are only two public institutions in the United States which steadfastly deny that the Bill of Rights applies to them. One is the military and the other is the public schools. Both are compulsory. Taken together, they are the chief socializing institutions of our society. Everyone goes through our schools. What they learn--not from what they are formally taught but from the way the institution is organized to treat them--is that authority is more important than freedom, order more precious than liberty, and discipline a higher value than individual expression. That is a lesson which is inappropriate to a free society--and certainly inappropriate to its schools.[1]

Glasser writes of the case of Walter Crump, who was expelled from the High School of Music and Art in New York City for violating one of the most crucial norms that Philip Jackson identified; Crump challenged the authority and power of one of his teachers. As Glasser relates the case, just a few weeks before Crump was due to graduate, he became involved in "a minor verbal altercation," involving "no violence or threat of violence," with a teacher:

> It was the kind of a verbal flare-up that occurs daily in almost every imaginable setting, and which usually passes without damage to either party.[2]

---

[1] Glasser, 1971, p. 208

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 209.

Glasser's main concern in this case is that the actions taken against Crump were in blatant violation of the New York City Board of Education regulations. Crump was summarily suspended and told to go home until further notice the afternoon of the incident--though regulations required that a parent be notified before a student was sent out of school. Not until twelve days later did Crump's foster mother receive notice of a "guidance conference" to deal with the matter eight days from that time--though school regulations theoretically barred Crump's principal from keeping Crump suspended more than five days without a hearing. Crump was unable to persuade his foster mother to attend the "conference," and he himself was 45 minutes late arriving. When he did arrive, he found that the hearing had been held without him and that he had been dismissed from school. Parents of fellow students had attempted to represant Crump at the hearing, but their requests had been denied--in violation of a New York State law that granted the right of such representation. Compounding the problem was the fact that the school persuaded the Bureau of Child Welfare to cut off payments to Crump's foster mother, since he was at this point classified as over 18 and out of school.

One of the friends' parents who had tried to represent Crump arranged for an appointment for him with an attorney from the New York Civil Liberties, and suit was filed in federal court. Nonetheless, the Bureau of Child Welfare persisted in holding payments, though Crump's contesting the dismissal made this action illegal. After winning his request for a new hearing by the school, he was finally reinstated, and he graduated from high school three weeks afterwards. Glasser comments:

> If what happened to Walter Crump had been an isolated instance, it would be no less outrageous; but at least one could not easily draw inference about an entire school system. In fact, however, the procedures which governed Walter Crump's case govern other cases as well. The frightening thing about the procedures followed by school officials in the Crump case is precisely that they were *routine*. The independent experiences of several respected agencies in New York--the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, Citizens Committee for Children, the New York Mobilization for Youth, and several parents associations--suggest that what happened to Mr. Crump happens regularly and widely to anyone facing suspension. Two things may be said about the procedures governing student suspensions in New York (and there is no reason to believe that New York is unique; although some other cities may enjoy better procedures, cases raising the same issues have arisen all over the United States):
>
> 1. The procedures represent a gross denial of the constitutional right to due process, including the right to a fair hearing.
>
> 2. Even those inadequate procedures are regularly violated by school officials.[1]

Since, as we have argued earlier, the different participants in a school system--the students, teachers, administrators, and other staff--bring with them into school sets of expectations that owe their existence to causes operating outside the school, it is not surprising to find that students are sometimes expelled for violating norms that have clear political connotations. In discussing the Crump case, Glasser argued that there are legal constraints on the mechanisms through which schools may enforce sanctions against student deviance. He also argues that the law--in particular, the First and Fourteenth Amendments--constrains schools altogether from enforcing sanctions against student deviance from certain classes of norms. In short, he argues that deviance from certain norms is a political or personal right. A group of black students in Mississippi, he writes, was suspended in 1965 for wearing buttons saying "Freedom Now" to school. Since no disruption was involved in the act, it seems highly probable that the message of the buttons--or its associations--was in violation of norms held by the school administration. The Fifth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals, reinstating the students, ruled that there was no lawful basis for the suspension, since wearing the buttons did not cause significant disruption of the educational process.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

In a case involving similar issues, the U.S. Supreme Court reinstated John Tinker, his sister Mary Beth, and a friend, Christopher Eckhardt, who had been suspended from a Des Moines, Iowa high school for violating school rules by wearing black armbands to express their opposition to the Vietnam war. The standard of the Mississippi case was upheld: freedom of expression was held to be a protected First Amendment right, unless actual disruption occurs; mere fear that disruption might occur was ruled insufficient grounds for curtailing expression. We would interpret this ruling as saying that a student has the legal right to deviate from norms whose content is overtly political, but that deviance from norms relating to school and classroom administration--the norms Jackson analyzes--receives no such protection. However, some issues involving freedom of expression are still unresolved, Glasser reports. Rights of students to distribute and possess unauthorized printed materials are still in dispute. Further, the legal power of schools to regulate student dress and appearance is unresolved. Circuit Courts cannot agree on the issue, and so far the U.S. Supreme Court has declined to decide on it.

In sum, then, Glasser's analysis suggests that the law regulates the procedures a school must follow for pushing students out of school--for providing sanctions against deviant behavior--and has placed some limits on the kinds of norms a school may enforce. He also implies, however, that schools frequently ignore the constraints of law, that they often enough get away with it, and that significant issues of student rights are still unresolved.

"Force-Outs"

A number of organizations, including the National Education Association's Center for Human Relations, the Southern Regional Council, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Legal Defense Fund, have expressed concern over what they see as massive expulsions of black students from recently desegregated schools. Though so far most of their documentation has concerned southern schools, they claim that the phenomenon reaches into the north as well. These organizations allege that the administrations of many desegregated schools care or understand little about the needs and concerns of black students. This fact provokes the students to engage in some disruptive actions, which in turn allows the administrations to expel black student leaders, using the rationalization that they have violated codes of conduct. Boyd Bosma, Assistant Director for Civil Liberties and Intergroup Relations in the Center for Human Relations of the N.E.A. writes:

> The example is given of the superintendent who repeatedly ignores legitimate student requests, finally meeting with student representatives only after a sit-in and boycott have threatened the stability of the system, and then reneging on promises to fix the gym and enlarge the cafeteria after

> his expulsion of several of the student leaders. What can be done for a student when "he's labelled as one of the bad apples, one of the bad crowd, so when you get a guy who tries to make a constructive effort to solve the problem and then he's victimized worse than the guy who is smoking marijuana in the bathroom, then were do you leave students?[1]

From information reported by the Southern Regional Council, the Mississippi Teachers Association, the American Friends Service Committee, and the N.E.A. itself, among other sources, the National Education Association has compiled some numbers suggestive of the magnitude of the problem. From July, 1970 to May, 1972, the N.E.A. claims, they have documented 24,866 suspensions and expulsions and 2,570 in 11 southern States. The numbers of students expelled and suspended by State are: Alabama, 411; Arkansas, 243; Florida, 1486; Georgia, 802; Louisiana, 357; Mississippi, 24; North Carolina, 1224; South Carolina, 2696; Tennessee, 436; Texas, 12,250; Virginia, 4937.[2]

Since, however, only 256 districts out of 2,780 in the States examined are included in this survey, the actual numbers are probably much higher. Bosma estimates that anywhere from 50,000 to 100,000 southern blacks are being pushed from school each year. Further, since the N.E.A.'s numbers depended largely on newspaper accounts, even these estimates may underrepresent the problem. Bosma asks:

> What about those districts where the boycotts have continued for months, even through entire school years, inadequately reported because of local news blackouts and indifference or hostility of public officials and community leaders?
>
> Who can tell how many students are daily suspended, expelled, or driven out of the schools because of arbitrary and discriminatory actions by school authorities?

---

[1] Bosma, 1972, p. 8.

[2] Shire, 1972, enclosures, p. 1.

> Who can measure the educational consequences when students simply drop out, faced with the realities of a system which patently is not for them, which never has been and perhaps never will be theirs?
>
> And, too, how many stay in school, expressing their alienation and frustration either through open hostility, active resistance, or merely passive non-compliance?[1]

The N.E.A. and the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense Fund have suggested a variety of strategies for dealing with the problem. Some have been purely legal, including contesting school actions in court and training lay advocates. The N.E.A. has contacted a number of colleges to see if ways can be found to admit students who have been denied their high school diplomas. If the analysis and numbers these groups report are correct, however, we find it difficult to avoid the conclusion that many students are being forced from school essentially for the violation of one simple norm: these students fail to wear white skins.

In this context, the results of Lawrence Vredevoe's study of the effects of desegregation on school discipline are interesting. He studied 102 schools, interviewing administrators, students, parents, lay leaders, school board officials, and community agents, in addition to conducting some group interviewing. He concluded that blacks may enter newly desegregated schools with some hostile attitudes, because they associate the school administration with landlords and other agents whom they see as the cause of the miserableness of their environments. The determining factor, however, of whether disruptions will occur is the school. If black students find a competent staff and a supportive mental climate and if they perceive that the school is committed to serving their needs, disruptions will not occur. Stating the point negatively, it may be that disruptions will occur if their initial suspicions are confirmed.[1]

---

[1] Bosma, 1972, p. 8.

The Way We Go to School: The Exclusion of Children in Boston

Another category of pushout is the one whom the Task Force on Children Out of School has called the "excluded child." In their study of Boston school-age children not in school they discovered a large number of children, many of elementary school age, who were out of school because the schools either did not provide the educational services they needed or found it inconvenient to let them attend regular schools. Examples of such pushouts are:

— A Spanish-speaking 15-year-old whose family recently immigrated to this country and who knows little English. The language barrier would make success in a regular classroom impossible, yet the school system offered no program appropriate to his needs. Since he was close to his sixteenth birthday, the school system recommended that he not try to attend at all.

— A black teenager who recently moved to Boston from the rural South with her illiterate parents. The dialect she speaks and her inability to communicate in standard English make for as much of a language barrier as that experienced by the Spanish-speaking immigrant, and the school system has been as helpful in meeting her needs.

---

[1] Vredevoe, 1967, p. 5.

-- A young girl who has experienced petit mal seizures. Though the seizures have been completely controlled through medication, and her doctor strongly endorses her ambition to attend school, she is not allowed to attend public elementary school because school administrators want to avoid "responsibility" for her.

-- A young boy who became emotionally disturbed at the death of his father and who, because of this, became irregular in his attendance. His school reacted by sending a truant officer to his home to issue threats and by assigning him, without his mother's knowledge, to a class for mentally retarded students, which was actually more of a dumping ground, since those assigned to it received no significant services. Finally, he was suspended and received no steady educational services for two years.

-- A young woman found to be pregnant in February of her senior year. Her school reacted by ejecting her, ending her plans to become a nurse.[1]

The Task Force identifies three general categories of "excluded children." First are those who are out of school without ever having been in. These are mostly members of cultural minorities, and many speak only Spanish. Boston, at the time of the Task Force report, offered no significant educational program for these people. Second are those who have not been allowed to attend or who have been forced to leave. In this class are children with physical handicaps, as the crippled, that would not interfere with their success in school but whom the schools have excluded even so. Also in this group are students who become pregnant. (That the crippled and pregnant are classified together reflects the schools' perceptions. When asked to explain the policy of excluding pregnant women from school, one official expressed the idea that "'pregnancy is an illness and pregnant girls do not belong outside the home.'"[1]) Third are children whose unique needs the school system does not meet. The mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed and those with perceptual handicaps belong in this category.

---

[1] Task Force on Children Out of School, 1970, pp. 7-12.

The Task Force identifies as the common quality of these three groups the fact that they are all "different": "'culturally different,' 'physically different,' and 'mentally or behaviorally different.'"[2]

Thus, one important aspect of the dropout phenomenon is the fact that many students, even at the elementary level, are ejected by their schools. In some cases, this ejection violates students' rights to due process, and the school many be expelling students for the exercise of legally protected rights. There is evidence, too, that there may be a wholesale expulsion of black students from newly desegregated schools, and these expulsions may be related to school administrators' lack of concern for black students' needs. Finally, schools may be refusing to serve many students from cultural minorities, pregnant students or those with physical handicaps, and students with special needs.

---

[1] _Ibid._, p. 32.

[2] _Ibid._, p. 13.

VII. WOMEN DROPOUTS

It seems obvious to common sense that dropping out will be a different matter for women than for men and that it will have different consequences. Such matters as career planning, marital expectations, job entry, and employment experiences are clearly different for the two sexes. Sex-related patterns of school staffing, too, seem likely to elicit different responses to the school environment from male and female students. Likewise, that dropping out will be different for male and female students is a reasonable conclusion from considering dropping out as social deviance. It is reasonable to believe that schools will confront female students with different expectations from males. While both sexes might face similar demands in the performance of school work (though even here differences seem likely, since certain areas of study are commonly identified as "femine" and others as "masculine"), and while the same standards of conformance to norms of institutional order are probably expected of both sexes, teachers and administrators undoubtedly bring into school with them other expectations that are different for the sexes. We have already seen that some schools enforce strict sanctions against women who have violated norms of sexual behavior. We have found no evidence that schools are as strict with men; and schools have a harder time identifying male transgressors, since they do not get pregnant.

It seems likely, too, that expectations relating to social mobility will be different for the two sexes. The expectation that students aspire to middle class status seems likely to weigh more heavily on men than on women, since the typical pattern of such mobility probably depends more on men's employment than women's. (Regional and other exceptions to this rule are, of course, likely.)

Despite these reasons for believing that the dynamics of dropping out is substantially different for the different sexes, there is not much hard information detailing how. Only males were studied in Youth in Transition. Likewise, Bullock's study of students in segregated Houston high schools ignored women. Rosalie H. Wax's study of Oglala Sioux, too, concentrates on male dropouts. Much of her analysis concerns patterns of child raising that apply only to boys. Thomas and Wahrhaftig, partly for the reason that they are studying cultures in which male dominance is a fundamental fact, largely ignore the unique problems of women in school.

There is some evidence that is suggestive of differences in dropping out for men and women. The study of dropouts conducted under Project TALENT treated men and women separately, and some interesting differences emerge. (Whether Project TALENT results are trustworthy is a controversial question. The chief defect of the study is its very low response rates. Only 37 percent of the sample on whom dropout results are based responded to follow-up data collection efforts, and the rate was lower for dropouts than stay-ins.[1] Though Combs and Cooley argue that methods were employed that were adequate for compensating for bias due to this low response rate, William H. Sewell, president of the American Sociological Association, does not agree.

---

[1] Combs and Cooley, 1968, pp. 344-345.

He cites apparent discrepencies between results Project TALENT reports from its 1965 panel and 1970 census data.[1])

The Project TALENT dropout data are from a data collection from a national sample of ninth graders in 1960 and a follow-up collection in 1964. The sample was divided in 1964 into dropouts and "controls" (high school graduates not entering college). Graduates going on to college were excluded from separate analysis but appear in totals. A first significant difference is in the relationship between academic ability and educational attainment. While 55 percent of male dropouts were in the bottom quartile (for all males, not for both sexes) of General Academic Ability Composite score, and only 5 percent in the top quartile, the equivalent proportions for females were 40 and 7 percent. In comparison, 28 and 11 percent of male controls were in the bottom and top quarters, respectively, and 17 and 15 percent of female controls were in these categories.[2] The implication of these numbers seems to be that measured academic ability distinguishes better among males of all three levels of academic attainment than among females.

On the other hand, socioeconomic level seems to distinguish better between female dropouts and controls than between males, but it seems to distinguish better between males who attend college and those who do not than between these two classes of females. Among males, 51 percent of dropouts are in the bottom quarter in socioeconomic level, and 6 percent in the top. The comparable numbers for females are 61 and 3 percent. For controls, 48 percent of males are in the bottom quarter and 3 percent in the top; 41 percent of females are in the bottom and 8 percent in the top.[1]

---

[1] Sewell, 1971, p. 797n.

[2] Combs and Cooley, pp. 345 and 355.

Another difference is in the ability of interests to predict the likelihood of dropping out. The Project TALENT Interest Inventory revealed relatively few differences between male dropouts and controls. Controls indicated greater interest than dropouts in sports and the area of physical science, engineering, and mathematics. Dropouts showed greater interest in labor, skilled trades, and music. Among females, however, this test of interests revealed more differences. Controls scored higher than dropouts in: social service; biological science-medicine; computation; sports; physical science, engineering, math; and public service. Dropouts scored higher than controls on: labor; skilled trades; mechanical-technical; and hunting-fishing.[2]

In distinguishing between dropouts and controls, then, academic ability is a less efficient predictor for women than for men; socioeconomic level is a more efficient predictor for women than for men; and interest in areas of professional careers is a better indicator of likelihood of graduating for women than for men. What these facts taken together mean is not clear. A possible explanation is that schools' response to male students is more highly differential than to female students. These data might mean that the expectations male students encounter in school tend to be related to each individual's measured academic ability, while all female students tend to encounter similar expectations, relatively unrelated to individual ability. The male student with high ability will find encouragement and pressure in school to attain, while his equally talented sister will be less likely to encounter these expectations. Sewell reports results supporting this hypothesis and indicating, further, that parents similarly encourage their sons more than their daughters.[1] Therefore, the determinants of women's attainment (to the level of high school graduation) will, by default, become socioeconomic level and particular, internalized ambitions.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 351 and 357.

[2] Ibid., pp. 347 and 356.

Project TALENT results indicate significant differences in post-school experiences of male and female dropouts. Though Combs and Cooley argue that reasons dropouts give for leaving school tend to have little meaning[2], a view with which we agree, it is probably significant that three-fourths of women dropouts reported "Got married" as their reason for leaving.[3] By the time of the August 1964 data collection, 81 percent of the women but only 44 percent of the men who dropped out were or had been married.[4]

Women's employment experiences were different from men's. While 90 percent of male dropouts and 89 percent of male controls were employed, women's rates were lower. Among woman dropouts, 26 percent were employed; 58 percent of single and 18 percent of married female dropouts held jobs. In contrast, 53 percent of women controls were employed. Significant differences are reported, too, in the kinds of jobs held. Male dropouts tended to be unskilled workers, skilled workers, or service workers, while male controls tended to be unskilled, skilled, or clerical and sales workers. Female dropouts tended to be miscellaneous service workers or laborers, while female controls were mainly stenographers, secretaries, or clerical workers. While the mean yearly salary for male dropouts was $3650 and for controls, $3500, the comparable numbers for women were lower. Dropouts earned $2570, and controls earned $2790.[1] Just from these data, it is of course impossible to find the reasons for all these differences. Some likely causes are discrimination in the labor market, role stereotyping in schools and home, and the operation of general societal expectations, but the relative weight of each and how they interact cannot be determined. It is, however, significant that for women, high school graduation is associated with higher earnings and employment rates. Further, it is the key to jobs as secretaries and similar work.

---

[1] Sewell, 1971, p. 800.

[2] Combs and Cooley, 1968, pp. 351-352.

[3] Ibid., p. 358.

[4] Ibid., p. 359.

Of interest in this context is the finding of Lee _et_ _al_., who report that schools do tend to pigeon-hole women students. They suggest that high school teachers and counselors tend to channel female students from "a lack of information and a continuation of traditional stereotypes about socially desirable roles for women" and from a persistent belief in a "limited number of 'appropriate' female occupations."[1] While they do not connect this result to dropping out or to students' later employment, it is not unreasonable to believe that both attainment and employment are influenced by these expectations.

---

[1] _Ibid_., pp. 352 and 358.

---

[1] Lee, et al., 1971, p. 24.

VIII. DROPOUT DEFINITIONS AND ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

Purpose

To this point, our discussions have been rather theoretical. Yet school systems face a serious practical problem when they set out to determine precisely how many students are dropping out from their schools--and to decide what precisely they mean by the term "dropout." Similarly, the utility of a theoretical study of dropping out may be very limited if its definitions make comparison with other studies impossible. Examining the various definitions and accounting procedures for dropouts, then, as used in theoretical studies, school system studies, and dropout prevention projects, can have at least three purposes.

The first purpose of such an examination is to reveal sources of elementary error, if they exist, so that they may be avoided in the future. For example, one significant finding of an examination of the ESEA Title VIII dropout prevention projects was that students who left school during summers--between terms--were frequently ignored when dropout statistics were compiled. This fact might be used to support the position that Title VIII projects whose current systems are that deficient be required to allocate some of their grant money to the development of new pupil accounting systems.

A second purpose is to support uniformity of definition and procedures. While this has for some time been a goal of both the

---

[1] Mertens, 1972, "Summary Statement," pp. 3-4.

U.S. Office of Education and the National Education Association,[1] it has yet to be achieved. If the differences that still exist among reporting procedures can be identified and the reasons why they still exist can be divined, progress toward this goal might be aided.

A third and in some ways the most basic purpose is to identify points of discrepancy that dropout definitions and accounting procedures might create between the processes of schools as institutions and the substance of education. It is a commonly observed fact that as a goal becomes institutionalized, the institution comes to expend its efforts not to advance the goal itself as it was originally conceived but to further the process with which the goal has now become associated. The ends of the process and the goal may no longer coincide at every point and may even be at odds on certain points. The goal behind a dropout prevention project is presumably to increase the proportion of young people who make effective use of available educational resources. When translated into institutional terms, this goal is stated as a decrease in dropout rate, which is a measure of the proportion of young people who become disaffiliated from high school before being certified as graduates. Already the assumption is implied that proceeding

---

[1] John F. Putnam and George G. Tankard, Jr. proposed in 1964 proposed a standardized pupil accounting system, which would include a definition of dropouts and a procedure for counting them. Their reasons for supporting such a standardized system are as valid today as then:

"The universal use of the terminology in this handbook can improve the quality of education by facilitating the along the road to a diploma is equivalent to receiving the substance of an education. Refinements in this definition, though administratively logical, may move it further from the original goal. A person may, for example, be classed a dropout if he leaves school for even a few weeks, whether or not he later returns to graduate. Though it might be argued that under certain circumstances for certain individuals such leave taking might promote educational growth, a school system geared toward reducing its dropout rate would tend to discourage it in every case. Further, the school system might find no reason to encourage his return to school once he has left, since it would not erase the statistic that he had dropped out, and could even find reason

---

meaningful evaluation, realistic planning, and efficient operation of education systems throughout the United States. This standardized terminology provides a basis by which items of information about pupils can be recorded, reported, and studied adequately. When such information is used, records and reports about pupils may be prepared with greater speed, accuracy, and flexibility." (Putnam and Tankard, 1964, p. 1.)

The Project on School Dropouts of the N.E.A. built on the work of Putnam and Tankard to develop standardized procedures for school systems to conduct dropout studies. They sound a similar theme, but negatively: they outline the loss of usefulness of dropout studies due to anarchic reporting procedures:

"[Since its inception in September, 196[1], innumerable dropout studies and reports have come to the attention of the Project. It became increasingly evident as these reports accumulated that each was independently prepared with little attention to standardization or uniformity of terms, data reported, or method of calculating the dropout rate used. On some occasions, in fact, two consecutive reports from the same school system would be totally inadequate for comparison purposes. Indeed, comparability between most of the studies was practically impossible." (N.E.A., 1965, p. 5.)

to discourage the return, since he might be figured a good risk to drop out again. In this case, the logic of the institution would dictate action contrary to the goal of promoting education. Of course, this is not to say that everyone within a school would act to reduce dropout rates whether or not students benefited, but goals that have become institutionalized may subvert the intent that originally lay behind them. Also, some of those within schools who most conscientiously tried to help young people might find that dropout statistics did not fairly reflect their efforts.

In the sections that follow, the procedures and definitions for counting dropouts will be analyzed for some theoretical and school system studies and Title VIII projects. Then we will examine the definitions and procedures of the system proposed for uniform adoption by the U.S.O.E. and the N.E.A. Finally, we will offer some recommendations for modification.

Theoretical studies

The studies examined here are Youth in Transition, conducted by the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research; the study published as Big City Dropouts and Illiterates, conducted under the auspices of the Center for Urban Education by Robert A. Dentler and Mary Ellen Warshauer; and Project TALENT.

Youth in Transition. On a conceptual level, members of the probability sample of 2,200 tenth grade boys in U.S. public schools selected for study at the beginning of the project were to be regarded at any given point in time as belonging to one of three categories:

in school - if primarily involved in a school environment

at work - if primarily involved in a work environment

unemployed - if not significantly involved in either a school or a work environment.[1]

Bachman writes that these categories, however, may not be that separate and distinct; in the reality of the experiences of the youth he studied, membership in a given category is not an either/or proposition but a continuum, and the categories, particularly work and school, can easily shade into each other. He states that he expects overlapping distributions and explains why:

> A major basis for this prediction is our belief that the usual assumptions of difference between school and work environment are gross oversimplifications. It is often assumed that in school students learn by precept and example; on jobs they utilize what they have learned. Yet there will almost certainly be schools which offer the student little opportunity to develop or use valued skills and no contact with adult male models with whom he can identify while some conditions of employment may be relatively rich in these respects. Differences within major categories of environment probably have done much to obscure enlightening comparisons between them.[2]

If one were setting out to study the effects of association with certain kinds of educational experiences, rather than the effects of schooling, this train of thought would lead to the conclusion that an adequate definition of "dropout" would be very complicated; it would, for example, count members of the sample who were participating in certain kinds of certified schooling as dropouts and others who had left school for certain kinds of employment as stay-ins. The purpose of the Youth in Transition study of dropouts, however, was not primarily to assess the effects of education per se; it was rather to assess the effects of secondary schooling. And, unlike most school systems that study their own dropouts, the Youth in Transition staff did not assume at the outset that high school graduation is good and dropping out bad. This was a hypothesis to be tested. Accordingly, their formal definition of a dropout, while it does not recognize in itself the distinction between schooling and education, does not do violation to that distinction:

---

[1] Bachman, et al., 1967, p. 11.

[2] Ibid.

> In the analysis reported herein we will define dropouts as those individuals who interrupt their full-time attendance in high school for more than a few weeks (and for reasons other than illness). This means that an individual may drop out and later return to school for his diploma, but we will still consider that he was at one time a dropout, and for most analytic purposes we will group him with all other dropouts (some of whom may also have diplomas by the time this is written).[1]

Thus, only full-time uninterrupted affiliation with a diploma-granting institution will count as school attendance, and summer dropouts will be counted, since leaving school at any point in the calendar year will count as dropping out.

At the times of data collection after their class had graduated, members of the study sample could be placed into three groups (not to be confused with the three "environments" discussed earlier): dropouts; high school graduates who were never dropouts and were not then primarily engaged in post-high school education; and high school graduates (or, conceivably, dropouts) "who were primarily engaged in post-high school education."[1]

---

[1] Bachman, et al., 1971, p. 5.

All members of the Youth in Transition sample were attending tenth grade at the time of the first data collection, October to November, 1966, and, in fact, the interviews, questionnaires, and tests used in the collection were administered in the boys' schools. Subsequent collections--in March to May 1968, April to June 1969, and June to July 1970--were all made in "neutral sites" off school premises. Members of the sample were individually contacted, usually by phone, to make appointments.[2] Further, brief questionnaires were mailed to sample members at six-month intervals, which included questions on their current occupational and educational status.[3] It seems, therefore, that dropouts were self-reported.

Since the study focused on youth in and out of school rather than on the schools themselves, summer dropouts would be identified equally as well as students dropping out other times during the year. At the fourth data collection, 73.2 percent of the respondents to the first collection could still be reached, and the research staff reportedly spent "considerable effort" trying to locate sample members who had moved.[4] Since the study was not an attempt to implement an accounting system, it was, of course, not necessary to know the whereabouts of all sample members at the time of the fourth collection.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 17.

[2] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[3] Bachman, et al., 1967, p. 27.

[4] Bachman, et al., 1971, pp. 16-17.

Big City Dropouts and Illiterates. The Dentler and Warshauer study of dropout rates and levels of adult illiteracy in the 131 largest cities in the Nation began with plans to compile estimates by mail from State and local education agencies, but these plans changed:

> After studying the dropout problem in general, and consulting with various associates, we found that one of the major problems in this area is the lack of uniformity in reporting statistics dealing with school retention and withdrawal. Many cities do not compile these figures in a usable form.[1]

Accordingly, an alternate plan was adopted, and this plan, in effect, determined the definition of dropout used. Data from the 1960 U.S. Census of Population were used to determine dropout rates in the cities of the study. In a given city, the number of person aged 14 to 19 whose last grade completed in school was 8, 9, 10, or 11 who were not enrolled in school was divided by the number of persons in that age group who had completed the same grades who were enrolled in school plus those who were not. There were at least two advantages to this system. First, a dropout would not be missed simply because he left during the summer, and, second, student migration was eliminated as a problem. Further, a member of the age group who had left school for a time but returned by the time of the census would be counted only under his current status, that of a student. Census data on school enrollment are from answers to question P16 of the Household Questionnaire:

> Has he attended regular school or college at any time since February 1, 1960?
>
> If he has attended only nursery school, business or trade school, or adult education classes, check "No."[2]

---

[1] Dentler and Warshauer, 1965, p. 70.

[2] U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1964, p. XLIX.

"Regular" schooling is defined as

> that which may advance a person toward an elementary school certificate, a high school diploma, or a college, university or professional degree.[1]

It seems, therefore, that part-time attendance would count but that only affiliation with formal, academic, diploma-granting institutions would count as high school attendance.

Project TALENT. A reading of Project TALENT documents has not uncovered a formal definition of a dropout, but the methods of the study show fairly clearly who was counted a dropout and who was not. In 1960, about 440,000 ninth- through twelfth-grade students (students in the classes of 1960 to 1963) were administered a battery of tests, and follow-up data were collected on each class during the year following graduation.[2] An analysis was made of dropouts from the class of 1963. The follow-up data were collected from a questionnaire mailed initially in August, 1964 and from interviews of some non-respondents. Members of the sample were asked to indicate the last grade they had completed and were asked further:

> Did you get a high school diploma?
>
> --Yes, at the time I finished grade 12.
>
> --Yes, by examination after I left high school.
>
> --No, I entered college at the end of grade 11.
>
> --No, I dropped out of high school.
>
> --No, I went through grade 12 but did not get a diploma.
>
> --No, I am still in high school.[3]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Combs and Cooley, 1968, p. 343.

[3] Flanagan and Cooley, 1965, p. A-1.

It seems clear enough that sample members who indicated the first, second, third, or sixth response on this list were not counted as dropouts and that those indicating the fourth response were. It is, however, unclear how members were categorized who responded that they had completed twelfth grade without receiving diplomas.

Therefore, a sample member who was attending what he would describe as high school, whether full- or part-time, would not be a dropout. The entire calendar year would be accounted for. A sample member could have left school before graduation yet not be counted as a dropout so long as he had returned or received a diploma by the time he completed the questionnaire. The other categories to which those who left school could be assigned would be graduates, recipients of equivalence certificates by examination, early college entrants, and those who completed twelfth grade without graduating, unless this last category was included with dropouts. Since the study did not operate as an accounting system, students could leave school and miss being counted in the follow-up collection. In fact, the response rate was considerably less than half, only 37 percent, as has been discussed earlier.[1] Transfer to another school by a sample member would make no difference, as long as the project could reach him with a mailed questionnaire.

This analysis has revealed no major internal definitional problems in any of these studies. The question of comparability is, however, more important. The Dentler and Warshauer study, because it was based on Census Bureau data, depended on Census Bureau definitions and survey procedures, and it seems unrealistic to expect those to change for the sake of uniformity among dropout studies. The two longitudinal studies of education, Youth in Transition and Project TALENT, though, were developed for purposes that at least overlap, yet there are enough differences between their dropout definitions to make precise comparisons of their results hazardous. A student who left school for a time but later returned or who passed an equivalency examination without returning would be counted as a dropout in Youth in Transition but as a stay-in in Project TALENT. A student who left full-time high school before graduating but continued in part-time attendance would be counted as a dropout in Youth in Transition but not in Project TALENT. A student leaving because of illness would count as a dropout in Project TALENT but not in Youth in Transition. Finally, dropout analysis in Project TALENT made use of data from only one follow-up collection, at a time about one year after the class studied was to have graduated, while Youth in Transition analysis was based on data from questionnaires mailed every six months in addition to four more complete follow-up collections.

---

[1] Combs and Cooley, 1968, p. 344.

As discussed earlier, the Youth in Transition definition of a dropout was intended to capture information on schooling more than on education. Even so, there is some gap between what it measures and the reality of the experiences of its sample members. The Project TALENT definition creates less of a gap. A student could leave high school, yet if he returned full-time or part-time or passed an equivalency examination, he would not be counted as a dropout. This definition is, therefore, more consistent with an intuitive conception of the term "dropout" and is probably more consistent with the self-definition of such a student.

School system studies

The studies considered here will be the Ruth C. Penty study of reading and dropouts in the Battle Creek, Michigan High School, a 1963 study by the Maryland State Department of Education, a 1963 study by the Louisiana Department of Education, and a 1967 study by this last body. All of these except the last were conducted before the publication by the N.E.A. of suggested standardized procedures.

Battle Creek High School. An elaborate definition of dropout is not stated. The word is explained simply:

> The terms *school leaver* and *drop-out* will be used interchangeably in referring to students who leave school before graduation.[1]

The study apparently relied on information routinely gathered by the high school, and the methods and definitions used are unfortunately not specified any further. It seems, though, that only full-time attendance at a formal diploma-granting institution would qualify a member of the study as a stay-in and that summer dropouts were counted. Other categories to which students leaving school were assigned were transfers and graduates, and numbers cited seem to indicate that every student studied could be assigned to one of these three.[2] There is no indication of efforts made to verify reported transfers to other schools.

---

[1] Penty, 1956, p. 11.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

Maryland State study. From June 1960 through May 1961, a Maryland Cooperative Study of Dropouts was undertaken by the State Department of Education. Information about dropouts--such as family background, kinds of school experiences, and reasons cited for leaving--was obtained by questionnaire from individual schools in the State.[1] Unfortunately, the report of the study does not provide a description of the questionnaire, an explanation of how schools obtained their information, or a statement of how dropouts were defined, except that they were students who left school before graduating.

Louisiana, 1963. Information was collected from school on students who dropped out during the 1962-63 school year on cards designed for that purpose. The only definition of school dropout given is rather vague: "the student who terminates his education prior to high-school graduation, at the least."[2] For the practical purposes of the study, the "at the least" expression was ignored. Terminating education was clearly enough taken to mean leaving school, but it was not so clear what kinds of transfers a student would be allowed before he was classed a dropout or on which side of the pale would fall patterns other than full-time, day attendance. It seems doubtful that summer dropouts were counted under the procedures used, even though the time of year when dropping out occurs is irrelevant in the definition.

---

[1] Maryland State Department of Education, 1963, p. 1.

[2] Robert and Jones, 1963, p. 1.

The main purpose of this brief analysis of these three studies has been to illustrate the vagueness in definitions and procedures of some studies. Cross-study comparisons are hazardous, and it is difficult to tell within a given study who is described by the word "dropout." One characteristic common to these studies is that their data collection relied on procedures already established in the schools being surveyed.

Louisiana, 1967. After the U.S. Office of Education and the National Education Association's urgings that local and State school systems adopt uniform definitions and accounting procedures, Louisiana incorporated into its yearly report a dropout definition that is nearly identical to Putnam and Tankard's.[1] The uniform accounting procedures, however, were not adopted--"visiting teachers" within the school systems simply collected information on identified dropouts--and, though information on summer dropouts is included, it is impossible to tell to what degree the standardized definition was adopted only on paper.

Title VIII projects

This same problem occurred among ESEA Title VIII dropout prevention projects during FY 1971. It often appeared that the language of standardized procedures was used to report information that had been collected by methods altogether different. Though the projects were required to report dropout rates on forms that incorporated important aspects of the N.E.A. and U.S.O.E. standardized procedures and terms, many projects relied on local education agency procedures for information gathering, disregarding those procedures suggested by the

---

[1] Hohmann, 1967, p. 2; Putnam and Tankard, 1964, pp. 53-54.

N.E.A. and O.E. A very common departure was in counting summer dropouts. At least three, and probably five or six, of the ten original projects failed to include them in their rates.

In some projects, such as those at Paducah, Kentucky, and Dayton, Ohio, non-systematic lists of "reasons" for withdrawing had to be made to correspond with O.E. definitions. The L.E.A. in Dayton, for example, established one class of withdrawing students as "losses: 8A." These were students who left for reasons of "deceased, illness or mid-term graduated [sic]." The evaluator found reporting results in O.E. terms difficult, because by O.E. procedures students classed here would belong to three quite distinct classes, viz., those who had died, dropouts, and graduates.

Not all projects computed rates by use of the base that N.E.A. procedures require. In Texarkana, for example, a dropout rate was computed with a start-of-year enrollment as a base, while standardized procedures call for a different number (discussed below).

Another difficulty that the Dayton, Ohio project documents report is that the U.S.O.E. insisted that very stringent conditions be met by the other school before a withdrawn student could be certified as a transfer instead of a dropout. According to the project evaluator, he was required to count as dropouts former students who were then in Ohio Youth Commission schools, schools for pregnant girls, night schools, summer schools, general education development courses, Job Corps, and other vocational training.

Because of the diversity of the projects, it would not be very useful to examine the procedures of each in greater detail. Of greatest significance is their departure from the standardized procedures and definitions they had presumably adopted.[1]

Pupil Accounting for Local and State School Systems

Putnam and Tankard describe their report as "the product of 4 years of cooperative work by 10 national education associations and the Office of Education."[2] Two national conferences, a policy meeting, a planning conference, and a technical conference were held during the course of its production.[3] It was an attempt to build a comprehensive, standardized system of student information collection and reporting procedures for elementary, secondary, and adult education schools and junior colleges under local or State education agency administration. Student information was to include the areas of: personal identification; family residence; physical health; standardized test and social and psychological information; enrollment; performance; transportation used; and tuition and special assistance.[4] Specifically relevant to dropout studies is the information to be collected under enrollment. A series of items permitting automatic data processing is listed with indications of whether each item is recommended or only optional for different levels of schools. Information to be collected on each student in regular (as opposed to summer) secondary schools includes:

---

[1] Information for this discussion is from Mertens, 1972, III.A.2.

[2] Putnam and Tankard, 1964, p. v.

[3] Ibid., p. ix.

[4] Ibid., p. 2-3.

ENROLLMENT INFORMATION
5000 Series

- 5100. Entrance Information
  - 5100. Type of Entry
    - 5110.10 Type of Original Entry
    - 5110.20 Type of Reentry
    - 5110.90 Other Entry (optional)
  - 5120. School From Which Incoming Pupil Is Received
  - 5140. Instructional Organization Entered
    - 5140.20 Secondary School Instructional Organization
  - 5150. Grade Entered
  - 5160. Location of Instruction
  - 5170. Type of Class
  - 5180. Principal Means of Instruction
  - 5190. Time Status
  - 5210. School and Teachers

- 5300. Membership and Attendance Information
  - 5310. Number of Days of Membership
  - 5320. Number of Days of Attendance
  - 5330. Number of Days Absent
  - 5340. Reason for Absence (optional)
  - 5350. Referrals Because of Absences (optional)
  - 5360. Number of Times Tardy
  - 5370. Number of Early Departures

- 5400. Withdrawal Information
  - 5410. Transfer
  - 5420. Completion of School Work
  - 5430. Dropout
    - 5431. Compulsory Attendance Status at Time of Dropping Out
    - 5432. Reason for Dropping Out (optional)
    - 5433. Residence After Dropping Out (optional)
  - 5440. Death

- 5500. Nonentrance Information
  - 5510. Reason for Not Entering Local Public Elementary or Secondary School (optional)[1]

This accounting system, if fully implemented within a school system, would undoubtedly provide internally consistent data that would be comparable with data obtained elsewhere by the same procedures. One of its most apparent virtues is that each student who entered the system would be accounted for at his departure. The problem of the uncounted summer dropout would, therefore, be eliminated. Student leavers would be sorted into four categories: transfers; those who completed schoolwork; dropouts; and those who died. A dropout is defined fairly precisely:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 12-21.

> A dropout is a pupil who leaves school, for any reason except death, before graduation or completion of a program of studies and without transferring to another school.
>
> The term "dropout" is used most often to designate an elementary or secondary school pupil who has been in membership during the regular school term and who withdraws from membership before graduating from secondary school (grade 12) or before completing an equivalent program of studies. Such an individual is considered a dropout whether his dropping out occurs during or between regular school terms, whether his dropping out occurs before or after he has passed the compulsory school attendance age, and, where applicable, whether or not he has completed a minimum amount of schooling.[1]

Some uncertainty enters the picture, however, when the categories of transferring and completing school work are examined. Under the definition of "School or School System to Which Pupil Transfers" Putnam and Tankard suggest that students would be classed transfers, not dropouts, if they left school for a "location of instruction which is not a school facility, such as instruction at home or instruction within a noneducational institution," and they imply elsehwere that students would be classed transfers if

> sent or transferred by legal authority to residential corrective institutions where they take part in instructional programs which can be applied toward the completion of elementary or secondary school programs.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 53-54.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 52.

These classes of transfers seem to conflict somewhat with the dropout definition, which specifies that "transferring to another school" will keep a student out of the dropout category. It is noteworthy that when this very conflict arose in the Dayton, Ohio dropout prevention project, the U.S. Office of Education ruled that entering only a very limited range of education experiences should be considered transferring.

The definition of "completion of Schoolwork" raises some other questions. A student may be put into that class of withdrawal if he "completes school in an approved manner," even if he does not receive a graduation diploma, so long as he "receives a certificate of attendance or a certificate of completion."[1] It is unclear how such a student would be distinguished from the one who "has completed a minimum amount of schoolwork," who would be classified as a dropout.

One other comment seems worth making. A student who left school for even a few weeks and then returned, provided that he returned in a new school term, would appear in the accounting books as a dropout and then a new entry. That he returned the next term would not erase his name from the dropout list.[2]

Dropout Studies: Design and Conduct

The National Education Association proposals for uniform dropout studies within States and local school systems were the outgrowth of an invitational meeting sponsored jointly by the U.S. Office of Education and the N.E.A. in October, 1963 for the purpose of promoting uniformity of terms and procedures. The system developed was intended to be compatible with the Putnam and Tankard handbook. Accordingly, definitions in that work were adopted. Other crucial aspects of the N.E.A. system include:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 53.

[2] Ibid., pp. 38-39.

Beginning date for calculations. The annual cycle for studies is July 1 to June 30.

Continuous membership. A pupil is a member of a class for the entire calendar year, until he leaves by graduating (or otherwise completing his work), transferring, dropping out, or dying. He does not have to reregister each fall to renew membership.

Arithmetic accountability. This is the key concept in the N.E.A. system. Its first implication is that a school system (or a school or State) must "balance its books"--must account for all students who enter it by identifying them either as having withdrawn or as being in current membership. The second meaning of arithmetic accountability is more concrete. It refers to that base from which all arithmetic computations for a year will be made and is the sum of end-of-year membership (June 30) plus all graduates plus dropouts (July 1 to June 30).[1] The date for determining arithmetic accountability is thus June 30, and its quantity is equivalent to the start-of-year members (the preceding July 1) plus transfers in, minus transfers out, minus deaths (all these quantities for July 1 to June 30). Further, in some contexts an arithmetic accountability will be for some period of time other than July 1 of one year to June 30 of the next, in which case the periods of time for counting the numbers of graduates and dropouts used in computing the accountability will be adjusted accordingly.

---

[1] National Education Association, 1965, pp. 24-25.

Annual holding power. This is defined as the quantity end-of-year membership (June 30) plus graduates, divided by arithmetic accountability.

Cumulative holding power. The power of a school to hold a Class (i.e., that group of students who enter a secondary school at about the same time and are expected with normal progress to graduate at the same time) as it moves through successive grades is measured by the total of graduates from the Class (end-of-year, mid-year, and summer) divided by the arithmetic accountability.

Dropout rates. Similarly, an annual dropout rate for a school (or a system or a State) is the number of dropouts (July 1 to June 30) divided by the arithmetic accountability (June 30). The cumulative dropout rate for a Class is the number of dropouts from the Class over the period of time studied divided by the arithmetic accountability at the end of that time.[1]

One aspect of the N.E.A. procedures should be noted. The implicit assumption is made that educational attainment is an either-or process, that one graduates or drops out. To use arithmetic accountability as a base for dropout rate computations means, for example, that if a student drops out on July 1 of one year or waits until June 30 of the next, he will have the same influence on an annual dropout rate, although in the latter case he will have been in membership for a year (minus a day) longer. This point arises in a discussion of why average daily membership (ADM) was rejected as a base:

---

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 26-29.

Title VIII projects, it is easier to develop such systems than to achieve their implementation. If the U.S. Office of Education seriously wants to promote uniformity in obtaining and reporting dropout information, it could begin by assuring that ESEA Title VIII projects employ uniform procedures. This could be accomplished either by requiring that some of the project grant money be set aside for this purpose or by providing other funds specifically for this purpose, if the costs would unduly drain money from other project activities.

The most beneficial modification in the uniform system would, we believe, be to expand the number of activities that would count as school attendance. Determining the precise range to be included would take much study, and the result would depend on one's philosophical bent. Activities, however, for which an argument could be made would include secondary schooling within correctional institutions, forms of independent study, Job Corps participation, formal apprenticeships, other on-site vocational education, attendance at certain proprietary schools, night high school attendance, and specialized schooling, as in music or dance.

A different train of thought can lead to a different conclusion about dropout definitions. In common usage, the word "dropout" has more meanings than the strictly technical. Timothy Leary associated the term with drug use and the act of removing oneself from American society. A syndicated cartoon called "Dropouts" concerns two characters whose main activity seems to be lying on a beach on a remote tropical island. Bachman quotes a song by a popular comedian-singer that associates dropping out with pool halls, jails, "hopped-up" cars, stupidity, and bad looks.[1] It seems, then, unlikely that a student who chooses to leave school before high school graduation will escape these connotations of the term "dropout." We believe that to characterize this student with these derogatory associations of the term is both inaccurate and unfair. We would agree with the statement of the Newman panel on higher education, as applied to high schools as well as to colleges:

> "Dropping out" is a pejorative term, and, we think, unfortunately so. Individuals should be able to "drop in" and "drop out" of college without social stigma.[2]

We would, then, agree with the suggestion that the term "dropout" be abandoned in favor of a more nearly neutral word, such as "school-leaver." Though we admit this term is less colorful, its adoption, if coupled with substantive reforms in the structures of American secondary education and with meaningful changes in attitudes toward education and schooling, could have some beneficial effects.

---

[1] Bachman, 1971, p. 3.

[2] Newman, 1971, p. 2.

IX. ESEA TITLE VIII PROJECTS

An analysis of dropping out as social deviance can contribute to an understanding of ESEA Title VIII dropout prevention activities. First, this analysis permits an assessment of the substance of projects' needs assessments. Second, it permits classifying project activities into efforts to promote students' conformity to norms and efforts to modify norms, which we believe is a useful basis for a critique of the projects. Third, this analysis lends itself to an assessment of how fundamentally the Title VIII projects are dealing with the educational problems of students in project areas.[1]

Three different modes of needs assessments are represented in the Title VIII projects. First, some assessments of local needs are simply attempts to correlate certain behavior and character traits with dropping out. An example of this kind of assessment is from the Baltimore, Maryland project. A "profile" of a typical dropout from the target area was developed from schools' records and interview data. This dropout was black, was as likely to be male as female, had poor attendance, received failing grades, and was likely to have been disciplined for "unsatisfactory behavior."[2] Two features of such an assessment are immediately obvious. First, it focuses on the dropout himself. Our analysis suggests that it would be more useful to focus on the interaction between the dropout and his specific school environment. Second, there is no formal attempt to construct a theory of causality. Dropouts are simply credited with possessing certain characteristics. This information may be helpful in identifying students likely to drop out, but by itself it is a wholly inadequate foundation on which to build a dropout prevention project. Yet administrators from some projects have made the leap from the statement that a dropout tends to possess a certain quality to the statement that that quality causes dropping out.

---

[1] The discussion that follows concerns only the ten original projects and makes use of information from project reports through FY 1971.

[2] Mertens, 1972, Baltimore, Md., II.A.4., p. 1.

The Texarkana, Arkansas project administrators, for example, observed that dropouts tended to be academically deficient and to have inadequate study skills and concluded that remedying these problems would prevent students from dropping out.[1] While we believe that teaching students study skills and giving them the opportunity to overcome academic deficiencies are laudable activities in themselves, it does not follow that these activities are the most efficient means of preventing dropping out. There is no reason to believe that academic deficiencies and inadequate study skills are the primary causes of dropping out. While this may be the case, it is just as reasonable to believe that these qualities and dropping out are both the symptoms of some more basic cause. We would tend toward the view that there is a more basic cause behind the symptoms of poor performance and study methods and that dropping out results from both this more basic cause and from the intervening symptoms. The question, however, is essentially empirical, and the Texarkana needs assessment has failed to answer it.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Texarkana, Ark., II.A.4., p. 1.

A second class of needs assessment depends on students', dropouts', teachers', or community members' perceptions of the causes of dropping out. The St. Louis, Missouri project conducted such an assessment by interviewing students, dropouts, and teachers. Some of the results were quite interesting. Teachers, for example, expressed their belief that smaller classes and schools would reduce dropping out, though neither students nor dropouts agreed. Students and dropouts rated pregnancy as about the most important reason for dropping out and the desire for a job as not far behind, but teachers considered both these reasons to be insignificant. In addition, dropouts placed higher importance on personal and family reasons than did the other groups.[1] While the utility of these results is obvious, and while it can be argued (and we would agree) that student and community perceptions can be the best base for building educational programs, these results do not in themselves make for a coherent theory of the causes of dropping out in St. Louis. (This is not to say that administrators who assume the need to reduce dropping out necessarily need such a theory. In fact, we believe that this was one of the best-utilized needs assessments and that the St. Louis project was, in general, one of the most successful.)

A third class of needs assessment contains those that attempt to come to grips with the fundamental causes of dropping out in given locales. An example is the Paducah, Kentucky assessment. Project administrators discovered that dropouts tended to come from poor and shattered families and discovered evidence that they lacked feelings of acceptance, worth, security, and love. The administrators concluded, too, that schools made matters worse by emphasizing students' weaknesses rather than strengths and by belittling them rather than emphasizing their worth.[1] Having thus analyzed dropping out as a psychological problem resulting from students' poor relationships with family and school, the administrators sought to build a program that would counteract rather than reinforce the destructiveness of students' home environments.

---

[1] Ibid., St. Louis, Mo., II.A.4., pp. 1-2.

It has been noted that project activities can be placed into two classes, those that promote students' conformity to school norms and those that involve modification of the norms themselves. Whether student conformity or norm modification should be supported depends on the specific case. An ideal project would begin with a specific understanding of the goals schooling was to accomplish in the project area. Project administrators would then analyze those expectations that dropouts were unable to meet and attempt to determine whether these expectations were actually necessary to achieve the goals. If not, an expectation would be abandoned. If, however, they were found to be necessary, students would be given what help they needed to meet the school demands.

Activities in the Paducah project can be placed into each class. The central component involved instructional reforms. Some of these reforms changed the nature of schools' academic expectations by changing the mode of instruction. Students participated in outdoor educational programs at a recreation and education center maintained by the Tennessee Valley Authority. There, lessons in language arts and mathematics would be removed from the abstract classroom setting and instead would be related to students' concrete activities. Similarly, "intensive unit" remedial instruction would offer students unable to adapt to the expectations of regular classrooms an alternative environment in which to succeed academically.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Paducah, Ky., II.A.4., p. 1.

On the other hand, other activities of the Paducah project were attempts to improve the schools' efficiency in persuading students to conform to the already existing norms. An important aspect of the "intensive unit" program, for example, was the use of techniques of behavior modification to lead students to conform better to the norms of classroom management, which Philip Jackson analyzed. The evaluation of this program included an assessment of students' conformity with a "Behavior Checklist." Among "inappropriate motor behaviors" identified on this checklist were: "turning head or head and body to look at another person; showing objects to another child; attending to another child." Other "inappropriate behaviors" included: "Blurting out. Vocal noises, singing, whistling, laughing, etc."[2] The project administrators seem to have taken the norms implied here as a given. We would question whether they actually are necessary in this form for educational growth.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Paducah, Ky., II.C.1., p. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*, Paducah, Ky., III.A.3., p. 1.

Other project activities, too, stressed improving students' conformity to existing norms. The central purpose of a "Home-School" component was to gain parent support for efforts to improve students' attendance, achievement, and behavior.[1] This seems to be the primary aim of most such attempts in Title VIII projects to establish stronger ties between the school and home.

It is worth commenting that those projects that provide services for pregnant students under the name "continuing education" are, by segregating these women from regular classrooms, persisting in consigning them to the status of social deviants, no matter how supportive an environment their special classes are. It is difficult to see how this practice can support any proper educational goal. If this policy of exclusion represents teachers and administrators' moral judgment, these students should be allowed to remain in regular classes, except in those rare instances when there is medical reason to remove them and unless being pregnant isolates them from their peer groups.

One crucial area of norms with which the Title VIII projects have not dealt contains those norms that arise from schools' social functions. The Paducah project, for example, attempted to modify some norms of academic performance and tried to promote better adaptation to expectations of classroom behavior, but norms relating to schools' socializing functions were ignored. The Batesland, South Dakota project was the only exception to this generalization. In their needs assessment, project administrators express the view that high dropout rates among the Oglala Sioux in the project area are only one symptom of the greater problem of Indian-white relationships in this country. The Indians, they argue, are faced with a great dilemma. On the one hand, they can retain their culture and traditions and live with the accompanying poverty, while on the other, they can become economically and socially assimilated into the dominant white world and lose their own sub-culture. The schools, the project administrators say, have failed to help these Indians reach realistic life-choices between these alternatives.[1] This analysis should lead to a recognition of school norms relating to the encounter between the two cultures within that institution.

---

[1] Ibid., Paducah, Ky., II.C.2., p. 1.

Unfortunately, however, project activities reflect little of this analysis or of Rosalie Wax's analysis of the "education problem" of the Oglala. Three project components were to deal directly with the fact of a high dropout rate among these Indians, but as of FY 1971, little of substance was actually being accomplished. A "parental involvement" component was to involve parents in the operations of the schools, from which they had long been alienated. As the component operated, however, it seems to have been basically a public relations arm of the school administration. The project evaluator could produce no evidence that parents' suggestions had any impact on the school administration, and a plan to train school board members in local communities apparently was shelved.[2] A component of "institution change," which was intended to remake the schools to provide better for the unique needs of the Oglala, seems to have accomplished very little of what it set out to do.[1] Further, a component designed to help students adjust to dormitory life seems to have been non-operational.[2] The thrust of this component, even on paper, was to lead students to accept life in dormitories. Yet, as Wax described, a fundamental problem was that the expectation that students should live in these dormitories was in conflict with the expectation that they reach certain levels of academic performance. Clearly enough, the situation called for changing the norms, not trying to promote students' conformity.

---

[1] Ibid., Batesland, S. D.,II.A.4., p. 1.

[2] Ibid., Batesland, S. D., III.B.1., p. 1.

The school system that was created for the Oglala Sioux is a clear-cut case of a social institution that has become destructive of the people it is charged with serving. The Batesland needs assessment reflects some sensitivity to this fact, yet project activities, instead of seeking to remake schools' social functions and expectations, have tried to lead students to conform better to the expectations as they are.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, Batesland, S. D., III.B.1., p. 1.

[2] *Ibid.*

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for an educational policy that would face the problem posed by dropouts arise from the analysis and research examined in this paper.

Vigorous action should be taken to confront the problem of student pushouts. The U.S. Office of Education should urge school systems to respect students' rights of due process and to First Amendment and personal expression. The exercise of legally protected rights should never become the reason for disciplinary action. Further, the U.S.O.E. should require that a part of all federally-funded dropout prevention efforts be the establishment of procedures to protect the rights of students threatened with suspension or expulsion. These rights include, but are not limited to, the right of the accused to know the offense he is charged with committing, the right to be represented by counsel, the right to access to all evidence against him, the right to testify and present evidence and witnesses, and the right to question his accusors.[1]

The U.S. Office of Education should immediately investigate charges of massive suspensions and expulsions of black students from recently desegregated schools. If the charges have basis in fact, the U.S.O.E. should do what is within its power to assure that the practice ceases.

Special services should be provided students with unique needs. Included in this group are the emotionally disturbed, the mentally retarded, and those for whom a language barrier exists, including students speaking only non-standard dialects of English. The practice of assigning these students to "dumping grounds" should cease.

---

[1] Several model systems exist. One, developed by the N.E.A. Task Force on Student Involvement, is the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities (Washington: N.E.A., 1971).

If the U.S. Office of Education is concerned with comparability in reportings of dropout rates, it should urge the adoption of uniform definitions and accounting procedures. In particular, school systems operating ESEA Title VIII projects should be required to institute a uniform system, financing it with part of their grant money if possible or with additional federal funds if necessary.

The idea of dropping out as social deviance should suggest a general approach to dropout prevention. If a school system is seeking to reduce the number of students who leave before graduation, its administrators should try first to understand what the specific expectations are in the school environment that these students are failing to meet. If meeting these expectations is essentially unrelated to educational achievement, they should, if possible, be abandoned. For example, the practice of banning pregnant students from regular classrooms should be stopped, with only a few exceptions, such as when legitimate medical reasons for exclusion exist or when such students will experience psychologically damaging peer-group rejection. Similarly, physical handicaps that do not interfere with education should be no reason for the denial of access to regular schooling. Further, no student should be excluded or otherwise penalized for the inability to conform to a single mode of learning. It should be recognized that equally able students may not be equally well suited to the same forms of instruction. Alternatives should be available.

The norms that arise from the artificial structuring of time that characterizes schooling should be abandoned. High school graduation should be possible well before a student has sat through twelve years of schooling, if that is his option. In generaly, much greater freedom for exit from and re-entry to high schools should be allowed. Credentialing and evaluation should, thus, be changed, perhaps to permit the certification of possession of skills rather than of years of schooling.

As educational options expand, so should the options of adult lives for which this education is preparatory. Individual aspiration to middle class life should not be the only social goal served by schooling (and there is great evidence that even this goal is being poorly served). Schools should encourage a variety of forms of social aspiration, some of which may allow continuing identity with one's sub-culture and some of which may allow group mobility.

To accomplish this end, communities must be returned the power to define the functions of their schools. Practical and philosophical problems no doubt exist in allowing communities this control if equality and social justice are not to be sacrificed, but these problems must be solved, for defining one's future of the future of one's children is a right that cannot be usurped without creating an alienation that itself defends against the external imposition of life definitions.

A dropout policy thus becomes a policy for remaking schools and their functions.

More research would be necessary to fill in the flesh of this outline of a dropout policy. Specifically, more detailed knowledge is needed of the ways in which schools socialize young people, of the kinds of mobility schools are best suited to encourage, and of alternative forms of mobility appropriate to the social and economic context of American life today. In addition, there is relatively little information on schools' effects on women. How do the expectations they encounter differ from men's? How does their rearing in comparison to men's prepare them to live in the environment of school? How do school staffing patterns that evidence discrimination against women affect their perceptions? These and related questions need thoughtful probing if the phenomenon of dropping out is to be understood.

REFERENCES

Bachman, J. G., et al., *Youth in Transition, Volume III: Dropping Out--Problem or Symptom?* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1971.

Bachman, J. G., et al., *Youth in Transition, Volume I: Blueprint for a Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Boys.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1967.

Bosma, Boyd, "Force-Outs." *South Today*, Vol. 3, No. 7, March 1972, p. 8.

Bullock, Henry Allen, *The Prediction of Dropout Behavior Among Urban Negro Boys.* ERIC no. ED 013 847, 1967.

Chansky, Norman M., *Untapped Good: The Rehabilitation of School Dropouts.* Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1966.

Coleman, James S., "How Do the Young Become Adults?" Baltimore, Md.: Center for Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University, Report No. 130, May 1972.

Combs, Janet and William W. Cooley, "Dropouts: In High School and After School." *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 3, May 1968, pp. 343-362.

Dentler, Robert A. and Mary Ellen Warshauer, *Big City Dropouts and Illiterates.* New York: Center for Urban Education, 1965.

Erikson, Erik H., *Childhood and Society*, 2nd ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1963.

Flanagan, John C. and William W. Cooley, *Identification, Development and Utilization of Human Talents.* Pittsburgh: Project TALENT Office, University of Pittsburgh, 1965.

______, *One-Year Follow-Up Studies.* Pittsburgh: Project TALENT Office, University of Pittsburgh, 1966.

Flanagan, John C., et al., *Design for a Study of American Youth.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.

Flanagan, John C., et al., *The American High School Student.* Pittsburgh: Project TALENT Office, University of Pittsburgh, 1964.

Friedenberg, Edgar Z., "An Ideology of School Withdrawal." Daniel Schreiber, ed., *The School Dropout.* Washington: National Education Association, Project on School Dropouts, 1964, pp. 25-39.

Glasser, Ira, "Schools for Scandal." Ronald Gross and Paul Osterman, eds., *High School.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971, pp. 208-220.

Goodman, Paul, "The Universal Trap." Daniel Schreiber, ed., The School Dropout. Washington: National Education Association, Project on School Dropouts, 1964, pp. 40-53.

Gunkel, Pat, "The Year 3000." Marc Libarle and Tom Seligson, eds., The High School Revolutionaries. New York: Random House, 1970, pp. 267-275.

Hohmann, Walter C., The School Dropout in Louisiana: 1966-1967. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Department of Education, 1967.

Jablonsky, The School Dropout: A Review of the ERIC Literature. ERIC no. ED 035 778, 1970.

Jackson, Philip W., Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Johnston, Lloyd D., and Jerald G. Bachman, "The Functions of Educational Institutions in Adolescent Development." (1972) Mimeo draft for: James Adams, ed., Understanding Adolescence, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1972 or 1973.

Kohlberg, Lawrence and Elliot Turiel, "Moral Development and Moral Education." Gerald S. Lesser, ed., Psychology and Educational Practice. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1971, pp. 410-465.

Langenbach, Michael and George A. Letchworth, Disciplinary Techniques: Repertories and Relationships. ERIC no. ED 049 178, 1971.

Lee, Sylvia L., et al., High School Senior Girls and the World of Work: Occupational Knowledge, Attitudes, and Plans. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1971.

Mead, Margaret, "Early Childhood Experience and Later Education in Complex Cultures." Murray L. Wax, et al., eds., Anthropological Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971, pp. 67-90.

Martens, William J., Review and Assessment of ESEA Title VIII Dropout., Prevention Projects for FY 1971. Unpublished, 1972.

Miller, S. M., "Dropouts--A Political Problem." Daniel Schreiber, ed., The School Dropout. Washington: National Education Association Project on School Dropouts, 1964, pp. 11-24.

National Education Association Project on School Dropouts, Dropout Studies: Design and Conduct. Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1965.

National Education Association Task Force on Student Involvement, Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities. Washington: National Education Association of the United States, 1971.

Newman, Frank, et al., Report on Higher Education. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971.

Penty, Ruth C., Reading Ability and High School Drop-Outs. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Putnam, John F. and George F. Tankard, Jr., Pupil Accounting for Local and State School Systems. Washington: Government Printing Office, U.S. Office of Education, State Educational Records and Reports Seriss: Handbook V, Bull. 1964, No. 39.

Robert, Louis D. and Wallace L. Jones, Jr., The School Dropout in Louisiana: 1962-1963. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Department of Education, 1963.

Schafer, Walter E., "Deviance in the Public School: An Interactional View." Edwin J. Thomas, ed., Behavior Science for Social Workers. New York: The Free Press, 1967, pp. 51-58.

Shire, Donald R., "Update #4 of Student Displacement Survey." (Memorandum; mimeo.) Washington: National Education Association, May 1, 1972.

Task Force on Children Out of School, The Way We Go to School: The Exclusion of Children in Boston. Boston: Boston University, 1970.

Thomas, Robert K. and Albert L. Wahrhaftig, "Indians, Hillbillies, and the 'Educational Problem.'" Murray L. Wax, et al., eds., Anthropological Perspectives on Education. New York: Basic Books, 1971, pp. 230-251.

U. S. Bureau of the Census, U. S. Census of Population: 1960, Volume I, Characteristics of the Population, Part I, Unites States Summary. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.

Vredevoe, Lawrence E., The Effects of Desegregation Upon School Discipline. ERIC no. ED 018 453, 1967.

Wax, Murray L. et al., Formal Education in an American Indian Community. Atlanta: Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1964.

Wax, Rosalie H., "The Warrior Dropouts." Trans-Action, St. Louis, Mo.: Washington University, May 1967, pp. 40-46.

Woollatt, Lorne H., "Why Capable Students Drop Out of High School." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals. Washington: NASSP, Vol. 45, No. 268, Nov. 1961, pp. 1-8.